

fresh
400



LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA

PRESENTED BY
MRS. MACKINLEY HELM



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
FOREIGN BIBLICAL LIBRARY.

EDITED BY THE
REV. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.,
Editor of the "Expositor."

*WEISS' MANUAL OF INTRODUCTION TO
THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

NEW YORK:
FUNK & WAGNALLS,
ASTOR PLACE.

A
MANUAL OF INTRODUCTION
TO THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BY
DR. BERNHARD WEISS,
Ober-Konsistorialrath and Professor of Theology.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY
A. J. K. DAVIDSON.

IN TWO VOLUMES. VOL. I.

NEW YORK:
FUNK & WAGNALLS,
ASTOR PLACE.
(All Rights Reserved.)

P R E F A C E .

It is almost necessary for me to apologize for putting forth an Introduction to the New Testament without being in a position to offer the results of recent, not to say the most recent, researches. Even the history of the Canon, which I hope I have advanced a step beyond the current combination and critical explanation of isolated facts, contains only the expansion of fundamental thoughts to which I have already given expression in a review of Credner's "History of the Canon" (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1863, 1). But the special Introduction touches on few problems, apart perhaps from the sections on the Corinthian and Johannine Epistles and the Acts, on which I have not already had occasion to express my opinion, discussing them minutely in some cases, and in many cases more than once. And although I am conscious of having learnt on all points, even from opponents, and of having in many respects advanced my conceptions, yet their basis has been preserved throughout. Nor is it the design of this book to assail with a renewed appeal for their assent, those who have hitherto been unable to accept the same fundamental views, much less those who have rejected them with vehemence, though without close examination, although I believe there is much that finds more favourable elucidation and more convincing proof from the unbroken connection of a general historical and critical survey in which it is here seen. My main object in this instance was not to give a statement of my views, but to

v

furnish a manual with the best methodical arrangement, the want of which I had long felt in my academical office.

Repeated attempts have indeed been made to satisfy this want, more especially of late; but these attempts fall too far short of the ideal I had hitherto formed of such a manual. In my view, the main thing in an Introduction to the New Testament is neither criticism nor apologetics, but the actual initiation into a living, historical knowledge of Scripture. In fact, all that I have hitherto published in the department of theology has only had this one aim, since it appears to me that nothing less than the whole future of theology and the Church depends on the wider diffusion and deeper character of such an understanding of the Scriptures. But I find this knowledge of Scripture endangered not only on the side of dogma, and by the unfortunate virtuosoship that makes the word of Scripture the sport of individual combinations of ideas or of brilliant rhetoric, but also on the side of criticism, where in the attempts to point out the historical influences of the time or the strife of dogmatic tendencies in the New Testament Scriptures, their religious character has only too often been utterly misapprehended. For this reason I have entered more minutely than is usual into an analysis of the train of thought of each particular writing, into the question of its religious and literary peculiarity, its composition as well as its historical premises and aims.

In so doing it is obvious that I could only set out with the views I had matured in the course of long familiarity with the New Testament, even where these have hitherto met with more opposition than assent. I am incapable the self-denial necessarily involved in making myself a mouth-piece for different views, a self-denial which is in many cases only apparent, betraying by incidental hints the contempt with which it looks down on all that does not fit into its own pattern. Nor do I hold it advisable merely to set

antagonistic opinions before him who desires to be instructed in such matters, without even attempting to show him a way in which to reconcile them. I believe that my opinions, the result of frequent and thorough examination, have at least the same claim to acceptance as those of my predecessors. I am conscious of having arrived at them, not in obedience to a preconceived theological view, but by impartial enquiry, and I maintain that they are just as much based on a general historical survey of the relations of the apostolic period, as the criticism that is so prone to claim for itself exclusively, the name historical.

On the other hand I have entire respect for all earnest scientific enquiry, even when it takes another direction than what appears to me correct; and I am not satisfied with a peremptory rejection of its results. I have endeavoured throughout to follow the history of scientific research as closely as possible into each separate question, and to present it to the reader. I have also allowed a hearing to the opposite view, with its reasons, and have endeavoured from history itself to learn and to teach how it may be refuted, though in every instance I look for the chief decision from the positive statement of the case agreeably to the sources from which it is drawn. The dependence on traditional premises, which is as great on the critical as on the apologetic side, I have now as ever fearlessly resisted, even where it is most confidently asserted. I do not profess to have enumerated all views, or mentioned all the names incidentally in favour of this or that opinion, even where such names may be renowned. Of actual fellow-workers on the problems of the New Testament I hope I have forgotten none. But I have not been able to follow up foreign literature to any extent.

Holtzmann in his Introduction says, Christianity has been "book-religion" from the beginning. In answer to this, I can only say, God be praised that it is not so. The opposi

tion of my conception of the New Testament to that of many modern critical tendencies, is perhaps most sharply concentrated in this antithesis. Christianity has from the beginning been Life; and because this life pulsates in its primitive documents, these cannot be explained or understood on the hypothesis of "literary dependences." I do not pretend to have entirely comprised within the limits of my Introduction this life, the fuller and deeper grasp of which is the aim of all theological science, or to have given it comprehensive expression, but I have honestly striven to do so. To the theologians who have been my hearers for more than thirty-four years, as well as those who in still greater numbers have received my former works on the New Testament with perfect trust, and to whom they have been a source of instruction, I offer this book also, as an introduction to the rich treasury of our New Testament records. I am aware that no scientific labour can unlock its deepest secret or lay it open to the understanding. But I know too, that without such labour the theologian is not well equipped for the preaching of the word and the battle of the present that is imposed as a duty on us all. May this book, under God's blessing, contribute to that end.

BERLIN, *August*, 1886.

B. WEISS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. I.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
§ 1. FOUNDING OF THE SCIENCE OF INTRODUCTION	1
1. The Patristic time.	
2. The Middle Ages and the Reformation.	
3. Richard Simon.	
4. Joh. Dav. Michaelis.	
§ 2. CRITICISM AND APOLOGETICS	7
1. Semler. Haenlein. Schmidt.	
2. Eichhorn. Bertholdt. Hug.	
3. Schleiermacher. De Wette. Credner.	
4. Guericke. Olshausen. Neander.	
§ 3. THE TÜBINGEN SCHOOL AND ITS OPPONENTS	12
1. Ferdinand Christian v. Baur.	
2. Zeller. Schwegler. Bruno Bauer.	
3. Thiersch. Ebrard. Lechler.	
4. Bleek. Ewald. Reuss. Ritschl.	
§ 4. PRESENT STATE OF THE SCIENCE	18
1. Hilgenfeld. Holsten. Volkmar.	
2. The Modern Critical School.	
3. Apologetic Tendencies.	
4. Problem and Method of the Science of Introduction.	

FIRST PART.

HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

§ 5. THE CANON OF THE LORD'S WORDS	28
1. Christ and the Apostles.	
2. Origin of a New Testament Literature.	

3.	The Old Testament and the Lord's Words.	
4.	The Canon of the Lord's Words.	
5.	Oral Tradition as the Source of the Lord's Words.	
6.	Oldest Traces of the Written Gospels.	
7.	The Fourth Gospel and the Epistles of John in the Apostolic Fathers.	
§ 6.	THE OLDEST TRACES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES	43
1.	Mention of the New Testament Epistles in the Apostolic Fathers.	
2.	Apostolic Authority in the Apostolic Fathers.	
3.	Traces of the New Testament Epistles in Clement.	
4.	Barnabas and Hermas.	
5.	Ignatius and Polycarp.	
6.	The Clementine Homilies and the Didaché.	
7.	Spread of the New Testament Epistles.	
§ 7.	THE GOSPEL CANON	54
1.	The Memorabilia of the Apostles in Justin.	
2.	The Use of the Synoptic Gospels in Justin.	
3.	The Fourth Gospel in Justin.	
4.	The Apostolic Writings in Justin.	
5.	The Fourth Gospel in the Apologists.	
6.	Tatian's Diatessaron. The Origin of the Gospel Canon.	
7.	The New Testament Epistles in the Apologists.	
§ 8.	THE CANON OF APOSTOLIC TRADITIONAL DOCTRINE.	73
1.	The Oral Apostolic Traditional Doctrine.	
2.	The Secret Tradition of the Heretics.	
3.	Going back of the Heretics to the Apostolic Writings.	
4.	The Falsification of Scripture by Heretics.	
5.	The Scripture Criticism of Heretics.	
6.	The Canon of Marcion.	
7.	The Raising of the Apostolic Writings to the Rank of Sacred Writings.	
§ 9.	THE NEW TESTAMENT AT THE CLOSE OF THE SECOND CENTURY	87
1.	The New Testament and its Parts.	
2.	The Gospels.	
3.	The Acts.	
4, 5.	The Apostolic Epistles.	
6.	The Apocalypse.	
7.	The New Testament at the End of the Second Century.	

	PAGE
§ 10. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON	102
1. The Bible of the Syrian Church.	
2, 3. The Muratorian Fragment,	
4. The West in the Third Century.	
5. Fundamental Principles of Canon Formation in Origen.	
6, 7. Their Application to the New Testament Writings.	
§ 11. THE CLOSE OF THE CANON IN THE EAST	119
1. The Time after Origen.	
2. The Division of the New Testament Writings in Eusebius.	
3. The Homologumena in Eusebius.	
4. The Antilegomena in Eusebius.	
5. Lists of the Canon in the Fourth Century.	
6. The Canonical Books of the New Testament.	
7. Virtual Close of the Canon in the East.	
§ 12. THE CLOSE OF THE CANON IN THE WEST	135
1. Philastrius of Brescia.	
2. Rufinus and Jerome.	
3. Augustine.	
4. The Canon and the Romish See.	
5. The Middle Ages and the Council of Trent.	
6. The Reformers and the Evangelical Church.	
7. Criticism of the Canon.	

SECOND PART.

HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.

FIRST DIVISION. THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

§ 13. THE APOSTLE PAUL	149
1. Saul's Descent and Youth.	
2. His Conversion.	
3. The Beginnings of his Missionary Activity.	
4. His First Missionary Journey.	
5. The Development of his Apostolic Consciousness.	
6. The Development of his Gentile-Apostolic Consciousness.	
7. The Name Paul.	

	PAGE
§ 14. PAUL AND THE PRIMITIVE APOSTLES	166
1. The Standpoint of the Primitive Apostles.	
2. The Missionary Activity of the Primitive Apostles.	
3. The Occasion of the Apostolic Council.	
4. The Liberation of the Gentile Christians from the Law, and the Apostolic Decree.	
5. The Agreement Respecting the Missionary Field.	
6. The Occurrence at Antioch.	
7. The Primitive Apostles and Paul.	
§ 15. PAUL AS A FOUNDER OF CHURCHES	185
1. Paul in Lycaonia. Timothy.	
2. The Founding of the Galatian Churches.	
3. The Church at Philippi.	
4. The Church at Thessalonica.	
5. Paul in Berea and Athens.	
6. The Church at Corinth.	
7. The Return of the Apostle.	
§ 16. PAUL AS AN AUTHOR	201
1. The External Attestation of the Pauline Epistles.	
2. Lost and Supposititious Pauline Epistles.	
3. The Primitive Scriptures and their Preservation.	
4. The Epistolary Form.	
5. Literary Characteristics.	
6. Doctrinal Characteristics.	
7. The Language of the Apostles.	
§ 17. THE THESSALONIAN EPISTLES	218
1. The Situation of the First Thessalonian Epistle.	
2. Analysis of the Epistle.	
3. Criticism of the Epistle.	
4. The Second Thessalonian Epistle.	
5. The Criticism of the Epistle.	
6. The Misinterpretations of 2 Thess. ii.	
7. The Apocalyptic Combination of Paul.	
§ 18. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS	234
1. The Second Visit of Paul to Galatia.	
2. The Seduction of the Galatian Churches.	
3. The Historical Situation of the Galatian Epistle.	
4-6. Analysis of the Galatian Epistle.	
7. Paul in Ephesus.	

	PAGE
§ 19. THE CORINTHIAN DISORDERS	251
1. The Visit to Corinth and the Lost Epistle to that place.	
2. State of the Church at Corinth.	
3. Church Meetings and Church Order.	
4. The Corinthian Parties.	
5. Hypothesis respecting the so-called Christ Party.	
6. The Christ Disciples in Corinth.	
7. The Sending of Timothy to Corinth.	
§ 20. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS	267
1. The Embassy from Corinth.	
2-6. Analysis of the First Corinthian Epistle.	
7. Paul in Troas and Macedonia (the Hypothesis of a Lost Intermediate Letter).	
§ 21. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS	282
1. Accounts of Titus from Corinth.	
2. Occasion of the Second Corinthian Epistle.	
3-6. Analysis of the Second Corinthian Epistle.	
7. Paul in Corinth.	
§ 22. THE CHURCH AT ROME	293
1. The Historical Situation of the Roman Epistle.	
2. The Beginnings of the Roman Church.	
3. The National Character of the Readers of the Roman Epistle.	
4. The Polemic View of the Epistle.	
5. The Conciliatory View.	
6. The Prophylactic View.	
7. Object of the Roman Epistle.	
§ 23. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS	308
1-5. Analysis of the Doctrinal Part of the Roman Epistle (Chaps. i.-xi.).	
6. Analysis of the Hortatory Part (Relation of Chaps. xii. xiii. to the First Epistle of Peter. The Ascetic Direction of xiv. 1-xv. 13).	
7. Analysis of the Close of the Epistle (Genuineness of Chaps. xv., xvi. The Letter of Commendation to Phœbe for Ephesus. Genuineness of the concluding Doxology).	

	PAGE
§ 24. THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.	323
1. The Apostle's Journey to Jerusalem and Imprisonment there.	
2. The Captivity of the Apostle in Cæsarea (Epistles written there). Accounts from Phrygia.	
3. The Theosophic Ascetic Tendency in Phrygia.	
4. The Development of Paulinism in the Epistles of the Captivity.	
5. Analysis of the Colossian Epistle.	
6. Criticism of the Colossian Epistle.	
7. The Epistle to Philemon.	
§ 25. THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS	339
1. The Original Destination of the Ephesian Epistle.	
2. Analysis of the Epistle.	
3. Its Relation to the Colossian Epistle.	
4, 5. Criticism of the Ephesian Epistle.	
6. Object of the Epistle (Relation to the First Epistle of Peter).	
7. The Voyage to Rome.	
§ 26. THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS	358
1. The Roman Captivity of the Apostle and its Results.	
2. Occasion and Object of the Philippian Epistle.	
3. Analysis of the Philippian Epistle.	
4, 5. The Criticism of the Philippian Epistle.	
6. Historical Testimony respecting Paul's End.	
7. His Liberation from the Roman Captivity.	
§ 27. THE PASTORAL EPISTLES	374
1. Analysis of the First Epistle to Timothy.	
2. Determination of the Date of the Epistle.	
3. Analysis of the Second Epistle to Timothy.	
4. Determination of the Date of the Epistle.	
5. Situation and Contents of the Epistle to Titus.	
6. Determination of the Date of the Epistle.	
7. The Composition of the Three Epistles after the Apostle's Liberation.	
§ 28. THE PECULIARITIES OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES	390
1. The Doctrinal Errors Combated in the Pastoral Epistles.	
2. Historical Determination of the Same.	
3. The Doctrinal Method of the Pastoral Epistles.	

	PAGE
4. The Mode in which they are Written.	
5. Church Order in the Pastoral Epistles.	
6. Beginnings of the Office of Teacher (Apostolic Helps. The Ordination of Timothy).	
7. Worship in the Pastoral Epistles.	
 § 29. THE CRITICISM OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. . . .	409
1. Schleiermacher. Eichhorn. De Wette.	
2. The Older Criticism Untenable.	
3. The Modern Criticism of the Pastoral Epistles.	
4. The Alleged Object of their Supposititious Character Untenable.	
5. The Dividing Hypotheses.	
6. The Apologists of the Epistles.	
7. Result.	

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. FOUNDING OF THE SCIENCE OF INTRODUCTION.

1. THE history of the origin of the New Testament Canon gave spontaneous rise to a series of enquiries, in which the science of Introduction afterwards originated. When the historical memorials of the apostolic time began to acquire regulating importance in the Church, this period already lay more than a century behind the Church Fathers, who made the origin of these memorials the basis of their recognition. In the writings of the intervening time only isolated references to this origin occur; for the most part the gap was bridged over by oral tradition alone. Even so early as the end of the second century, all desire for more exact knowledge as to the circumstances of their origin was virtually met by a reference to the utterances of these writings themselves and to conclusions derived from their contents. But when, in the third century, the need arose of limiting the circle of writings that should be valid for the Church, it immediately became apparent that their transmission was neither uniform nor assured; hence the necessity and warrant to test it by the character of the writings themselves. The utterances of Origen respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of Dionysius of Alexandria respecting the writings transmitted as Johannine, already involve a criticism on internal grounds. Eusebius of Cæsarea, in his Church History (about 324), set himself the task of collecting all that he regarded as important in the opinions of earlier writers respecting the

Holy Scriptures, and sought to classify them according to the degree of their ecclesiastical recognition in tradition. His work, notwithstanding its many deficiencies, is still the richest and most indispensable mine that we possess for the history of the Canon, as well as for that of the origin of its various writings. He was closely followed by Jerome, towards the end of the century, in his compilation, *De Viris Illustribus s. Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum* (392), besides which, there is nothing of importance except a few particulars contained in the introductions of Chrysostom's commentaries and homilies. Of the notices given by Bible manuscripts in their *ὑποθέσεις* or canon-lists, some are very scanty, others manifestly incorrect. Augustine indeed indulges in theoretical discussions as to the principles of canonicity in his work *De Doctrina Christiana*, but he does not get beyond the enumeration of our twenty-seven New Testament books, which were canonized by the African synods in his time and under his influence.

2. Throughout the Middle Ages the world was content with the "Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures" (*Institutiones Divinarum et Sæcularium Lectionum*), written by Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus for the monks of his cloister, which however, with respect to the Canon, goes back only to Jerome and Augustine.¹ Nor did the Reformation period achieve a revision of the established ecclesiastical tradition respecting the Canon, on the basis of independent

¹ The *introductores sacre scripturæ* whom he enumerates, 1, 16, and among whom the work of Adrian expressly bears the title of an *εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὰς θείας γραφάς*, are occupied almost exclusively with hermeneutic rules. The work of his contemporary, the African Junilius (*Instituta Regularia Divinæ Legis*), following the tradition of the Syrian school at Nisibis, alone enters into a classification of the Holy Scriptures according to their authority, which substantially goes back to that of Eusebius. Again, the *Isagoge ad Sacras Literas* of the Dominican Santes Pagninus (Lucca, 1536), which as regards the Canon simply copies Augustine, is essentially hermeneutic, also the *Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ* of Matthias Flacius (Basle, 1567).

historical research. Men like Erasmus and Cajetan, Luther and Carlstadt did indeed incidentally go back, in the Catholic and Protestant interest respectively, to the varying opinions of the Fathers before the time of the relative close of the Canon; Luther even venturing to assume an attitude hostile to tradition by an independent criticism of the Scriptures. But after the Catholic Church at the Council of Trent (1546) had given ecclesiastical sanction to the established Canon, Sixtus of Siena, the learned Dominican, in his *Bibliotheca Sancta* (Venice, 1566), could only make it his aim to defend this Canon against all heretical attacks, while Protestant theology, which asserted Holy Scripture to be the only source and standard of all truth, in opposition to the tradition of the Catholic Church, could not possibly be disposed to throw doubt on the established Canon by researches of an historical and critical nature. It was her interest rather to establish the theory of its inspiration, and to prove the authenticity of Holy Scripture throughout. After Andreas Rivetus, in his *Isagoge s. Introductio Generalis ad Scripturam Sacram V. T. et N. T.* (Lugd. B., 1627), had in this respect taken the lead in the Reformed interest, Lutheran theologians, such as Michael Walther (*Officina Biblica*, Lips., 1636), and Reformed, such as Joh. Heinr. Heidegger (*Enchiridion Biblicon*, Tigur., 1681), vied with each other in an uncritical accumulation of the necessary patristic material. It was only in Socinian and Arminian circles that a more independent judgment respecting the origin of individual New Testament writings was ventured upon (e.g. Hugo Grotius, in his *Annotationes in N. T.*, Paris, 1644). Such truly scientific work as was applied to the New Testament confined itself to an examination of language and text, as for example the copious *Prolegomena* to the London Polyglot of Brian Walton, Bishop of Chester, 1657.

3. *Richard Simon*, the learned Oratorian of Paris, is re-

garded as the founder of the science of Introduction. His desire was to show Protestants the untrustworthy character of their Scripture principle, and therefore his attention was mainly directed to the history of the New Testament text, which according to him had already undergone many corruptions and alterations in the course of time, after the originals had been lost. He also enters minutely into the history of the translations and explanations of the New Testament, protests most emphatically against a mechanical conception of the inspiration of the word of Scripture as such, and asserts that the Holy Scriptures proceeded from authors who, though inspired, were still human. It is true he is far from giving an independent criticism of the New Testament Scriptures on internal grounds. He enters, however, very fully into the divergent opinions of the Church Fathers and heretics with regard to individual writings, which he was able to do with greater impartiality, since his Church had by its decision put an end to all vacillation. From his standpoint it is possible for him to adhere to the Hebrew original of Matthew and to form a more unbiassed opinion respecting the relation between it and the Greek Gospel; he can incline towards the theory of a Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews which is only indirect, and where the language of the New Testament is concerned, can side entirely with the Hebraists in opposition to the Purists; and he can freely discuss the genuineness of the conclusion of Mark's gospel, the paragraph respecting the woman taken in adultery, and the passage 1 John v. 7; but his judgment is still for the most part reserved.¹ It was not so much the individual results at which he arrived as the

¹ The principal work of Simon bearing upon the New Testament is his *Histoire critique du texte du N. T.* (Rotterd., 1689), with which compare the addenda in his *Nouvelles observations sur le texte*, etc. (Paris, 1695). The first nineteen chapters in particular treat of the authenticity of the New Testament writings and their succession. His *Histoire*

new spirit of genuine historical inquiry that pervaded his works, bringing the Holy Scriptures into suspicious analogy to other literary testimony, that drew upon him decided opposition even on the Catholic side (e.g. J. B. Bossuet). In any case, estimable Catholic scholars, such as Ellies du Pin (*Dissertation préliminaire ou prolégomènes sur la bible*; Paris, 1699) and Augustin Calmet (*Dissertations qui peuvent servir de prolégomènes de l'écriture sainte*, Avignon, 1715, much enlarged edition) did not continue the work in his spirit. On the Protestant side, J. Heinr. Mai wrote a continuous criticism of his work, which was very favourably received (*Examen Historicæ Criticæ N. T. a R. S. vulgatæ*, Gissæ, 1694); while others, on the Lutheran side (Joh. Georg Pritius, *Introductio in Lectionem N. T.*, Lips., 1704), as well as the Reformed (Salomo van Til, *Opus Analyticum*, Traj. ad Rh., 1730) kept to the old course of accumulating learned material without independent scientific elaboration.

4. The department of the history of the text was the first in which a freer scientific movement and the beginnings of true criticism were reached. In the prolegomena which John Mill prefixed to his critical edition of the New Testament (Oxford, 1707) the ideas current in the Church as to the origin of the N. T. writings are adhered to absolutely and defended against all objections; but his very history of the text shows that at the hands of the copyists it met with a fate exactly analogous to that of other works of antiquity, and his rich collection of various readings made inevitable the need of a critical examination and amendment of the text accepted by the Church. This work was in fact vigorously commenced by the Würtemberg prelate, Joh.

critique des versions (Rotterd., 1690), and *Des principaux commentateurs du N. T.* (Rotterd., 1693), is of still greater importance. Respecting it, comp. Graf, in *Die Beiträge zu d. theol. Wiss.*, Heft 1 (Jena, 1847); and Baur in *Die Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, 4.

Albr. Bengel, in his critical edition of the New Testament (Tübingen, 1734), and by Joh. Jac. Wetstein of Basle, in his Prolegomena to the New Testament (Amstelod., 1730), which appeared in an altered and enlarged form in his edition of the New Testament (1750-51). *Joh. Dav. Michaelis* also, in his "Introduction to the New Testament" (Göttingen, 1750), which at first followed R. Simon closely, but in the fourth edition (1788) swelled out from a moderate octavo into two large quarto volumes, occupies himself in the first part mainly with the history of the text, but in the second part with the origin of all the New Testament books; from which the object of such a work may be seen, and the true starting-point supplied in order to a right understanding of it. But this great increase in size not only yielded new results in the department of textual criticism; the conception of the New Testament as a whole, as well as the treatment of its separate books, is unmistakably penetrated by the spirit of a new period which had meanwhile dawned. The first edition starts with an assumption that these books were inspired, and proceeds to prove it by an appeal to miracles and prophecy as well as the unanimous testimony of the ancient Church; while, on the other hand, the fourth edition gives prominence to the argument for their authenticity and credibility.¹ The work, translated into various languages, into English by Herbert Marsh (Cam-

¹ A distinction is drawn between the writings of the apostles and those of their disciples, whose inspiration he regards as doubtful in proportion to distance of time. With admirable candour the tradition respecting each single work is examined, while mention is also made of later doubts. Cautious as his judgment is, he is not unaffected by the spirit of a freer criticism. It is a doubtful point with him whether Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. Although we cannot come to full certainty as to who was the author of the Epistle of James, he finds it more and more probable that he was the half-brother of Jesus, not the apostle. He cannot accept the Epistle of Jude as canonical; and it appears to him almost supposititious. As to his uncertainty with respect to the Revelation of John, he thinks it necessary to excuse himself at length.

bridge, 1793), who furnished it with notes and additions (comp. the German translation of them by Rosenmüller, Gött., 1795, 1803) is the first comprehensive attempt to extend the science of Introduction to the New Testament, and accomplishes all that the means and the method of his time rendered possible.

§ 2. CRITICISM AND APOLOGETICS.

1. The revolution that made way for a freer examination of the Canon and the individual books of the New Testament was mainly the work of *Joh. Salomo Semler*. In his *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Kanon* (Halle, 1771-75, comp. *Apparatus ad liberalem Ni Ti Interpretationem*, Halæ, 1767) he originated and defended with indefatigable zeal his distinction between that which in the New Testament Scriptures was to be regarded as the Word of God or canonical and which according to him was to be found only in what conduced to moral improvement, and that which was local, temporal and Judaizing in them, making the Apocalypse in particular so distasteful to him, and the theory of its apostolic origin so hard to accept. The current conception of inspiration was thus abandoned, and the canonical authority of each separate book made independent of the view taken of its origin. The questions of their genuineness and integrity could now be discussed with perfect impartiality, and just in proportion to the closeness of connection between the former dogmatic idea of the Canon and the views of its origin that had been handed down, was the polemic against it characterized by a tendency to bring everything to light and to lay stress on what appeared to contradict it.¹ The epoch-making influence of Semler is

¹ Semler produced little of importance in the department of New Testament criticism, although he gave currency to many doubts with

already visible in *Alex. Haenlein* (*Handbuch der Einleitung in die Schriften des N. T.*, Erlangen, 1794–1800, 2. Aufl. 1801–9). Here already, proof of the genuineness, integrity and credibility of the New Testament writings takes the place of discussions on inspiration. The traditional views of their origin are indeed almost universally adhered to, but in many cases only a preponderance of probability is claimed for them. *Joh. Ernst Christ. Schmidt* makes a still more determined attempt to relegate all examination respecting the Divine origin of these writings entirely to the sphere of dogmatics, expressly and designedly entitling his “Historico-critical Introduction to the New Testament,” *A Critical History of the New Testament Writings* (Giessen, 1804, 1805, under new titles, 1809, 1818). In pleasing style he examines the origin of the separate books and their reception into the Canon, letting the history of the text follow, but extends his inquiry also to several ancient writings outside the Canon. In many cases the examination arrives at no certain conclusion; already doubts crop up respecting 2 Thess. and the first Epistle to Timothy, while the second Epistle of Peter is still more decidedly said to be supposititious. J. F. Kleuker, however, put forth his *Ausführliche Untersuchungen der Gründe für die Aechtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit der schrift-*

respect to individual books of the New Testament, emphasised anew the difference between the Apocalypse and the Gospel of John, doubted the direct apostolic origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the first Epistle of Peter, and brought 2 Peter, with Jude, low down into the second century, when the Canon was first settled as a work of the Catholic uniting process. He was all the more diligent in spreading and recommending foreign works adapted to further the treatment of the New Testament favourable to his own view. Hence appeared, in a German translation by H. M. Aug. Cramer, Richard Simon’s critical writings on the New Testament, with a preface and remarks by Semler, 1776–80. Semler published Wetstein’s *Prolegomena*, with remarks, Halle, 1764, as well as *Oder’s Work on the Apocalypse*, Halle, 1769. Comp. Corrodi, *Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Geschichte d. jüd. und christl. Bibelkanon*, 1792. Weber, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanon*, 1798.

lichen Urkunden des Christenthums (Hamb., 1788-1800) in opposition to the criticisms of Rationalism.

2. With full knowledge of the new principle, in pursuance of which "the attempt was made to read and examine the writings of the New Testament from a human point of view," *Joh. Gottfried Eichhorn* (*Einl. in das N.T.*, 5 Bde., Gött. 1804-27), was the first who tried to raise the science of Introduction to a criticism of the Canon. The reaction against the former fetters of tradition naturally led to a one-sided disregard of it, as well as to its rejection on insufficient grounds. It was now replaced by independent examination of the Scriptures, ingenious combination, by which new links were sought for discovered data, and a mania for hypothesis. The famous hypothesis of a primitive written gospel, by which *Eichhorn* endeavoured to solve the synoptical problem, is characteristic of this stage of criticism. He also solves the problem of the first Epistle of Peter by a mediating hypothesis. Still the criticism seldom ventures decidedly to dispute authenticity; the genuineness of the Johannine writings was not yet doubted, and it was only the Pastoral Epistles, 2 Peter and Jude, that were rejected. The history of the collecting of the books and of their text does not occur till the fourth and fifth volumes. *Eichhorn* is closely followed by *Bertholdt* and *Schott*, who wished to adjust the results of criticism to the current views, by means of ever new hypotheses.¹ This arbitrary indulgence in hypothesis was opposed by the Catholic professor, *Joh. Leonhard Hug*, at Freiburg (*Einl. in die Schriften des N.T.*, Tübingen, 1808, 3 Ausg., 1820). With comprehensive learning and inde-

¹ The heavy compilation of *Leonhard Bertholdt* (*Historisch-kritische Einl. in sämtliche kanonische und apokryphische Schriften des A. und N.T.*, 6 The., Erlang. 1812-19), by the very arrangement of the Old and New Testament writings under the categories of historical, prophetic, and poetical books, shows want of historical perception. The *Isagoge Historico-Critica in Libros Novi Fœderis Sacros*, of *Heinr. Aug. Schott*, rich in literary information, gives a better survey.

pendent investigation of the whole material, he advanced, chiefly in his General Introduction, the history of the Canon and of the Text, while the special part aims at a scientific apology for the traditional views respecting the origin of the individual books of the New Testament. But it is just here that we see how even Apologetics is unable to withstand the current of the time. The acute reasoning with which Hug defends traditional views is often as rich in subjective judgments and artificial combinations as is that of the criticism. His clever mode of presentation gained much acceptance and currency for the work, even among Protestant theologians; it was translated into English and French, and even after the author's death a fourth edition appeared, in 1847. The Catholic theologian, *Andr. Benedict Feilmoser (Einl. in die Bücher des Neuen Bundes, Innsbruck, 1810)*, enters far more deeply and with some impartiality into Protestant researches, especially in the second edition which is thoroughly revised and greatly enlarged (Tübingen, 1830).

3. As *Schleiermacher* promised to bring out dogmatically the opposition between supernaturalism and rationalism, so too he sought in the department of the science of Introduction to strike out new plans, by his, to some extent, classical research of details respecting the testimony of Papias with regard to Matthew and Mark, as also respecting the Gospel of Luke and the first Epistle to Timothy. His lectures on the *Introduction to the New Testament*, after having long exercised a powerful influence on Protestant theology, were first edited in 1845, by *E. Wolde*. His standpoint was most distinctly occupied by *Wilh. Martin Leberecht de Wette*, in his *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einl. in die Kanonischen Bücher des N. T.* (Berlin, 1826), which, remarkable for the precision of its style and its perspicuously grouped wealth of material, was widely circulated, passing through many editions. The independent examination of the separate books is much more minute and thorough, but the doubts

arising out of it are often much more subjective in their character. On the other hand its criticism is equally directed against the new hypothesis, and a stricter scientific investigation of detail leads to a truer appreciation of the tradition that had so hastily been rejected. Hence a certain vacillation, the criticism becomes sceptical, it remains in doubt, suspending its judgment, or ends with a purely negative conclusion.¹ *Karl Aug. Credner's Einleitung in das N. T.* (Halle, 1836), takes up essentially the same standpoint as de Wette's. Only the first part of his projected comprehensive Introduction appeared, which, in addition to a history of the science of Introduction, treats of the origin of the separate N. T. writings. His *Geschichte des N. T. Kanon* was edited from his papers, after his death, by *E. Volkmar*, who made additions to it (Berlin, 1860, comp. *Zur Geschichte des Kanon*, Halle, 1847). A very heavy compendium and survey of all recent research was put forth by *Ch. Gotthold Neudecker* (*Lehrbuch der Histor.-krit. Einl. in das N. T.*, Leipzig, 1840), but has no independent scientific value.²

4. Against the criticism of de Wette, *Heinr. Ernst. Fred. Guericke* directed his *Beiträge zur historisch-kritischen Einl. ins N. T.* (Halle, 1828-31), which was afterwards followed by his *Histor. krit. Einl. in das N. T.* (Leipz., 1843), a defence of collective tradition respecting the Canon, on the

¹ Many of his earlier expressed doubts (*e.g.* as to the second Epistle to the Thessalonians) have been retracted by de Wette in later editions; he has come forward more and more decidedly in favour of John's Gospel the favourite of the school of Schleiermacher, who sacrificed the Apocalypse to it; but he never got over his doubts respecting the Ephesian Epistle, 1 Peter and James. As to the Pastoral Epistles and 2 Peter, he declared them to be unapostolic. The history of the N. T. Canon is found along with the history of the science of Introduction in the first part of his manual, which specially contains an Introduction to the Old Testament (Berlin, 1817).

² From some such critical standpoint was produced the excellent Biblical Dictionary of Benedict Winer (Leipzig, 1820, 3 Aufl., 1847-8).

old dogmatic lines. Next to him special mention is due to *Hermann Olshausen* who had already entered upon this department by his book on the genuineness of the four canonical gospels (Königsberg, 1823) and a contemporaneous work on the second Epistle of Peter; and after 1830 had turned aside the criticism of de Wette in the introductions to his *Biblischer Commentar* with remarks that, to speak the truth, have little weight. A far more important work was *Aug. Neander's History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles* (Hamburg, 1832), in which also the origin and genuineness of all the N. T. writings are discussed, with most important concessions to criticism in respect to 1 Timothy and 2 Peter. The fourth and last edition, revised by himself (1847, comp. 5 Aufl., 1862), was in the notes directed against the new critical school then emerging. The *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* in particular have worked in his spirit since the year 1828.

§ 3. THE TÜBINGEN SCHOOL AND ITS OPPONENTS.

1. The merit of having placed the criticism of the N. T. Canon in fruitful connection with the historical investigation of primitive Christianity belongs to the Tübingen professor, *Ferdinand Christian v. Baur*. He it was who first made it the problem of criticism, (instead of being satisfied to dispute, with more or less confidence, the genuineness of this or that N. T. writing,) to assign to each work its place in the history of the development of primitive Christianity, to determine the relations to which it owes its origin, the object at which it aims, and the views it represents.

Thus criticism which had been till then of a prevailing literary character, became truly historic. Now began a much more incisive, more objective analysis of the individual books as to their composition and peculiar theological character,

a more exhaustive examination of ecclesiastical tradition, which was itself considered in its connection with the history of the development of the Church, in which the N. T. writings form essential factors. Baur began his critical labours with separate enquiries, in the *Tübingen Zeitschrift* respecting the Christ-party in Corinth (1831), with his work on the Pastoral Epistles (1835), as well as with treatises on the design and the occasion of the Epistle to the Romans (1836), and Origin of the Episcopacy (1838) in the *Tübingen Zeitschrift*. It became clearer and clearer to his mind that the apostolic era was powerfully affected by the conflict between early apostolic Jewish Christianity, which was essentially Ebionite, and the anti-Jewish universalism of Paul. While regarding the former as represented in the Apocalypse of the Apostle John, the sole remaining monuments of the latter are, in his view, the great doctrinal and controversial epistles of Paul to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans. In his great work on Paul (1845) he sought to prove the supposititious character of all other Pauline writings, endeavouring at the same time to show that the Acts of the Apostles, which was strongly at variance with his conception of primitive Christianity, was unhistorical. Hence the smaller Pauline epistles, as well as those N. T. writings professedly belonging to the original apostolic circle, could only be monuments of that reconciliation of opposites which was on many sides being gradually effected in the second century, and which after gnosis had been overcome and orthodox doctrine assured by the building up of hierarchical forms (comp. the Pastoral Epistles), found its doctrinal solution in bringing together Peter and Paul as the authorized teachers of the Catholic Church (comp. 2 Peter) and in the Johannine literature (about 170). His collected critical researches respecting the Gospels (1847) pointed out the way in which the literature of our Gospels also fits in with the course of this development. In his

work *Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (Tübingen, 1853, 3te Aufl., 1863), Baur condensed the result of all his researches in this department. Compare also Baur: *An Herrn Dr. K. Hase*, Tübingen, 1855; *Die Tübingen Schule und ihre Stellung zur Gegenwart*, Tübingen, 1859, 2te Aufl., 1860; and in addition, *Uhlhorn* in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1858.

2. What made this appearance of Baur so important was the fact that a number of gifted disciples stood at his side from the commencement, who were actively employed in carrying out his views with acuteness and learning, by means of the most exhaustive examination of details, so that mention is commonly made of a Tübingen school. The most important of them, *Eduard Zeller*, published after 1842, and subsequently in connection with Baur, the *Theologische Jahrbücher*, in which most of these works first appeared. Before the master himself had reached the result of his conclusions, *Albert Schweigler* brought out a history of the historical development of the apostolic and post-apostolic age, brilliant in style, in which carrying out Baur's tendency-criticism and from Baur's point of view, he assigned their part to the N.T. writings and the literature of the second century (*das Nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung*, Tübing., 1846-47). But it soon became evident that this development and the position assigned to the separate books in it, admitted views very divergent in character though starting from essentially the same standpoint, such as were developed by two other pupils of Baur, *C. Plank* (*Judenthum und Urchristenthum*), and *C. R. Koestlin* (*Zur Geschichte des Urchristenthums*) in the *Theol. Jahrb.* of 1847 and 1850, and presented by *Albrecht Ritschl* in his *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1850). *Bruno Bauer* took up with respect to the criticism of the Tübingen school a position that was quite isolated, for after his condensed critical researches respect-

ing the Gospels had deprived them of the last remnant of historical foundation (*Kritik der Evangelien*, Berlin, 1850-52), he turned to the criticism of the Acts (1850) and the Pauline Epistles (1850-52), all of which he declared to be supposititious. He afterwards made a second attempt to set forth his entire conception of Christianity (*Christus und die Cæsaren*, 1877; *mit einem Nachwort von* 1880), in which these writings figure as a product of the years 1830-70. His works had no appreciable influence on scientific progress.

3. Orthodox theology naturally felt called upon to defend itself with energy against a criticism which in its results led to a dissolution of the Canon as such, and allowed the greater number of its constituent parts to be lost in the stream of the history of doctrine along with other works of a very different character. After Heinr. Böttger's half-ironical disposal of Baur (*Baur's historische Kritik in ihrer Consequenz*, Braunschweig, 1840-41), W. O. Dietlein (*das Urchristenthum*, Halle, 1845) undertook to represent the history of the first two centuries rather as the struggle of a united apostolic Christianity with Jewish-Gentile Gnosis. Heinrich W. J. Thiersch, in his *Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts für die Kritik der NTlichen Schriften* (Erlangen, 1845), defended the genuineness of the entire Canon against all the attacks of modern criticism. In a somewhat milder form and not without traces of the influence of modern enquiry, he afterwards published his views in the first part of a history of Christian antiquity (*Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter und die Entstehung der NTlichen Schriften*, Frankfurt a. M., 1852, 3 Aufl., 1879). The learned investigations of C. Wieseler show that it was also possible from this standpoint to be entirely unaffected by modern criticism, as appears in his chronology of the apostolic period (Gött., 1848), in which a number of important questions belonging to Introduction are discussed

(comp. his *Comm. z. Galaterbrief*, Gött., 1859; and *Zur Geschichte der NTlichen Schriften*, Leipzig, 1880). On the other hand, J. H. A. Ebrard, in his *Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte*, 2 Aufl. (Erlangen, 1850), directed his half-spiteful, half-scoffing polemic against the Tübingen school, and undertook, after 1850 (Epistle to the Hebrews), to carry out and elaborate anew Olshausen's Biblical Commentary, in connection with J. T. A. Wiesinger, who worked upon the Epistles to the Philippians, the Pastoral Epistles, and those of James, Peter, and Jude, in a more thoughtful way, in declared opposition to the Tübingen school (1850-62). G. V. Lechler endeavoured to refute the Tübingen view of the development of primitive Christianity in an historical way, weaving his conservative views as to the origin of the N.T. books into the work (*Das apostolische und nach-apostolische Zeitalter*, Stuttgart, 1851, 3 Aufl., 1855). Comp. also John Peter Lange, *Apostolisches Zeitalter*, 1853-54.

4. The criticism of the school of Schleiermacher also assumed an attitude of preponderating hostility to the Tübingen criticism. For example, *Friedr. Bleek*, who took an advanced part in the discussion so early as 1846, in his *Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik*, and de Wette in the fifth edition of his Introduction (1848).¹ It was *Heinrich Ewald* who in his *Jahrbücher der bibl. Wissenschaft* (Göttingen, 1849-65) was foremost in carrying on, with roughest polemic, the struggle against the Tübingen school; while, in essential adherence to the standpoint of the criticism of Schleiermacher, though sometimes recalling the old times of the hypothesis-criticism, he lays down in numerous

¹ A sixth edition was edited after his death, by Messner and Lünemann. Bleek's *Einkl. in das N. T.* was published after the author's death, by his son Berlin, 1862. Comp. also the *Bibelurkunden*, published in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk* (vol. viii. 2), by Holtzmann (Theil 4, *Die Bücher des neuen Bundes*, Leipzig, 1866).

historical and exegetical works his own views respecting the origin of the N. T. books and the Canon.² Closely following him in every respect, but with his accustomed sobriety and scientific objectivity cutting away all excrescences of Ewald's subjective criticism, maintaining even the genuineness of the Epistle to the Ephesians, H. A. W. Meyer, in the Introductions to the separate parts of his *Kritisch-exegetischen Kommentar über das N.T.*, disputes on every occasion the views of the Tübingen school, along with his fellow-workers, Lünemann, Düsterdieck, and Huther, the last of whom even defended the Pastoral Epistles that had been given up by Meyer. *Ed. Reuss* took up a thoroughly independent position, a scholar who though allied to the Tübingen school in many respects in his fundamental views, yet decidedly rejected the proper tendency-criticism, especially in the Gospels, and arrived at much more positive results than the Tübingen school, in relation to the origin of the separate books.³ In many

² The sixth vol. of his *History of Israel* contains the history of the apostolic period (Gött., 1858, 3 Aufl., 1868), the seventh vol. contains that of the post-apostolic period (1859, 2 Aufl., 1869) in the appendix to which is a history of the Old and New Testament Canons. His works upon the Synoptical Gospels (1850) extended in a second edition to the Acts of the Apostles (*Die drei Ersten Evangelien und die Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen, 1871-72). The Johannine writings, translated and explained (Göttingen, 1861-62), contain in the first part the Gospel and Epistles, in the second the Apocalypse, which he does not assign to the Apostle. In his *Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus* (Göttingen, 1857), the only letters of the captivity explained are Philippians, Colossians, Philemon. *Das Sendschreiben an die Hebräer und der Jakobus Rundschreiben und Sieben Sendschreiben des neuen Bundes (die Briefe Petri und Judæ, Epheser und Pastoralbriefe)* did not follow till the year 1870.

³ His *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften N. T.'s* (Braunschweig, 1842) which more than doubled in extent after the 2nd edition (1853), and appeared in a 5th edition in 1874, is a first attempt, following the idea of Credner's plan, to present the collected material of the science of Introduction in an organic form as a history of the N. T. books, their collection for ecclesiastical use (history of the Canon), their preservation (history of the text), their dissemination (history of translations), and their use in theology down to the latest time (history of exegesis). Here

of his positions, Reuss, who even adheres to the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, has become more sceptical in the course of time. The contradiction which K. Hase (*Die Tübinger Schule, Sendschreiben an D. von Baur*, Leipzig, 1855) opposed to the Baurian conception of the apostolic period, was much more decided. But the most important event in the history of the contest with the Tübingen school was *Alb. Ritschl's* definite breaking away from the views of the Tübingen school in the second edition of his *Entstehung der alt. katholischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1857), in which he presented in opposition to it an independent conception of the development of primitive Christianity, allowing room for a much more impartial estimate of the traditional memorials of the apostolic age.

§ 4. PRESENT STATE OF THE SCIENCE.

With the close of the year 1850 the elder representatives of the Tübingen school came virtually to an end. *Adolf Hilgenfeld*, Baur's most assiduous disciple, now came to the front, and in 1858, in his *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, took up the inheritance of the *Theologische Jahrbücher*, where with indefatigable zeal he followed out all the phenomena in the department of the science of Introduction to the New Testament. After a series of works, he expounded his fundamental principles in a volume entitled *Das Urchristenthum in den Hauptwendepunkten seines Entwicklungsganges* (Jena, 1855). He aimed at moderating the contrast between Paulinism and primitive apostolic Jewish Christianity which formed the starting-point of Baur, vindi-

in the first part, as in Schweigler, the origin of the Canonical writings of the New Testament, and of those which for a time laid claim to ecclesiastical validity with and beside them, appears interwoven with the history of primitive Christianity, whose literature Reuss purposes to give.

cated the literary and historical character of his own criticism of the Gospels as opposed to the determining tendency-criticism, and went much farther back in the time of the separate books. By his defence of the genuineness of Philemon, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Romans xv. 16, as well as of the tradition respecting the end of Peter, he sought to cut away the most prominent excrescences of the Tübingen criticism, and thus visibly strengthened his position (comp. also in particular *Der Kanon und die Kritik des N. T.*, Halle, 1863; *Histor. krit. Einleitung in das N. T.*, Leipz., 1875). In these respects *Carl Holsten*, the ablest and most acute disciple of Baur, has remained more faithful to his teacher. After collecting, enlarging and publishing his works belonging to the years 1855, 59, 61 (*Zum Evang. des Petrus u. Paulus*, Rostock, 1868) he applied himself to a comprehensive exegetical exposition of his conception of Paul and his relation to the primitive apostles (*Das Evangelium des Paulus*, Berlin, 1880; comp. also *Die drei Ursprünglichen noch ungeschriebenen Evang.*, Leipzig, 1883). In his earlier works, however, we find growing evidence of a modification of Baur's principles still more incisive than that of Hilgenfeld. According to him the original standpoint of Peter is essentially allied to that of Paul, and only after the conflict at Antioch did the Judaistic gospel gain supremacy in the primitive apostolic circle, giving rise to the bitter opposition of the former apostle to the latter. On the other hand, *Gustav Volkmar*, who, after several other works, took part in carrying out the fundamental views of Baur by his *Religion Jesu* (Leipz., 1857; comp. also *Die geschichtstreue Theologie*, Zürich, 1858), devoting himself especially to a careful examination of the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature (comp. *Die Apokalypse*, Zürich, 1860), went beyond the criticism of Baur in daring, and placed many of the N. T. writings lower down in the second century (*Jesus Nazarenus*, Zürich, 1882; comp. also *Die Römerbrief*;

Zürich, 1875), although by putting Mark first he completely shattered the Tübingen theory of the Gospels, already abandoned by Hilg. and Holst. (*Marcus und die Synopsis*, Leipzig, 1870).¹

2. But many results of the Tübingen criticism, as well as the whole method of its investigation and many of its premises, are by no means limited at present to the circle of those who call themselves the disciples of Baur in a stricter sense, but are widely spread among the modern critical school. It is true that the historical picture of the apostolic and post-apostolic times up to the development of the Catholic Church as it appears at the end of the second century, having already undergone many modifications in the Tübingen school itself, although a new one adopted in wider circles had not yet taken its place, may be regarded as essentially abandoned. The following positions may be taken for granted as results of the modern school of criticism: that above and beyond the difference between Paul and the primitive apostles, however it may be formulated, there existed at first a wide basis of common Christianity, that had not been shaken in the apostolic era even by the conflict of extreme tendencies; that the development of the post-apostolic period is not conditioned by compromise between victorious Judaistic Christianity, and Paulinism that could only with difficulty and by concession hold its own against it, but by a reformation taking place within Paulinism itself or by a new independent development in Gentile-Christian circles, resulting from the operation of factors

¹ The results of the Tübingen school have been adopted abroad chiefly by the Dutchman Scholten (*Hist.-krit. Einl. in die Schr. d. N. T.*, 1853, 2te Aufl., Leyden, 1856), soon after surpassed by Pierson and Lomann in a radicalism reminding us of Bruno Bauer; as also with modifications by the Englishman Dr. Samuel Davidson (*An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, 1868, 2nd ed. 1882); and by the Frenchman E. Renan (*Histoire des origines du christianisme*, Paris, 1863-82), the last indeed going far beyond them.

other than Jewish Christianity. But predilection may still find the influence of Alexandrianism in many of the N. T. books, though fixing them at an earlier date and no longer seeking in them tendencies to union but solely evidences of the later phases of the development of Christianity. The circle of writings accepted as genuinely Pauline is not essentially extended beyond that already conceded by Hilgenfeld, even if we admit that the Epistle to the Colossians has in some parts a genuine foundation. The distrust of the Catholic Epistles, which was already confirmed in the view taken by de Wette, has been strengthened more and more into their definite expulsion from the apostolic age (comp. even Harnack: *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Freiburg, 1885), and recently the Epistle to the Hebrews has for the most part shared their fate. The criticism of the Gospels has essentially gained by having the ban of the Tendenz taken from it; but the modern critical school, in its decided rejection of the apostolicity of the fourth Gospel, recognises an indispensable monument of what it still regards as historical criticism. In its interest *Theodor Keim*, who, however, adopted a thoroughly mediating position in the question of the apostolic council (*Aus dem Urchristenthum*, Zürich, 1878), and Daniel Schenkel, who, in his *Christusbild der Apostel* (Leipzig, 1879), departed very considerably from many of the views current in the Tübingen school, gave up the entire tradition respecting the Apostle John's activity in Asia Minor. The standpoint of the modern critical school is especially represented by *Otto Pfleiderer*, who has however in his *Paulinismus* (Leipzig, 1883), as well as in later works upon the apostolic council and the Epistle to the Romans, essentially modified the sentence of condemnation pronounced by the Tübingen school on the historical character of the Acts; by *Adolf Hausrath*, in his *NTlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Heidelberg, 1868-73, 2te Aufl., 73-77); by Immer (*Theologie des N. T.*, Bern, 1877); and, above all, by *H. Julius*

Holtzmann, who has given a most instructive picture of the far-reaching scepticism to which this school leads, in his *Lehrbuch der histor. krit. Einl. in das N. T.* (Freiburg, 1885), after publishing numerous separate works on the Synoptical Gospels, on the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, the Pastoral Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Johannine letters. But Wittichen, Lipsius, Overbeck, Paul Schmidt, W. Brückner, Seuffert, and others also belong to this school. Besides Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, we have the *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, begun in 1875, in which the labours of this school are collected. Among them the labours of von Soden are pre eminent in acuteness, independence, and comprehensive mastery of material. Comp. also Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, 5 vols., Leipzig, 1869-75.

3. *Carl Weizsäcker*, who succeeded Baur in Tübingen, assumed a position of more marked antagonism to the Tübingen school (*Untersuchungen über d. evang. Gesch.*, Gotha, 1864; comp. *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1876); while *Wilh. Mangold* (in his *Bearbeitung des 3te Aufl. v. Bleek's Einl.*, 1875, 4te Aufl., 1886) attached himself more closely to Ritschl's construction of history. Yet the limits that separate the theology which, though occupied with the same scientific materials as the critical school, is more apologetic in character, are very fluctuating; for while the former did at least accept an indirect Johannine origin of the fourth Gospel, the latter has assumed an attitude of complete scepticism with regard to it, and in its latest development has come nearer the critical school with respect also to the Acts of the Apostles. *Willibald Beyschlag*, who was attached in many ways to the criticism of Schleiermacher and de Wette, has very strongly opposed the Tübingen school in different works on Paul and his opponents, as well as on the Gospels. The works of *Willib. Grimm* and *Klöpfer*, as well as others whose rallying-point is the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* (Stuttgart, 1857-79), occupy a position almost similar to his.

Comp. also *A. Riehm, Handwörterbuch des bibl. Alterthums*, Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1873-84. *Bernhard Weiss*, who first appeared in print with his *Petrin. Lehrbegriff* (Berlin, 1855), and then directed his attention chiefly to the criticism of the Gospels, in the course of his minute, exegetical, critical and biblico-theological works respecting modern criticism as a whole, arrived mainly at conservative results, as was also the case with others who revised Meyer's Commentary, and finally with the authors of articles on the N. T. in the *Realencyclopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche*, published by Herzog and Plitt (2te Aufl., Leipzig, 1877-86). On the other hand certain positions or arguments of the modern critical school might be refuted from the old dogmatic standpoint from which the Canon as such was looked upon as inspired; but this would be unprofitable, since they had no scientific basis in common. Comp. the new editions of Guericke's *Einleitung* (Leipzig, 1853, 1868), which appeared with the somewhat pretentious title, *Gesamtgeschichte des N. T., oder NTliche Isagogik*, the Commentaries of Keil, and the sketch of N. T. Introduction by *L. Schultze* in Zöckler's *Handbuch der theol. Wissenschaften*, Bd. 1, Nördlingen, 1883, 2te Aufl. 1885. *J. Chr. R. von Hofmann* has indeed attempted to set forth in a new form the traditional Canon as the organic substance of Scripture, which being a complete memorial of the beginning of Christianity and an all-sufficient index to the period between the beginning and the end of its history, in the indispensableness of its individual parts is a guarantee for their genuineness.¹

¹ Hofmann began his labours on Introduction in 1854 with treatises upon the history of the origin of Holy Scripture, in the *Erlangen Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche* (neue Folge, Bd. 28—Bd. 40), and then endeavoured to create an exegetical substructure for them in his great *Bibelwerk, Die Heilige Schrift N. T.'s*, Nördlingen, which appeared from 1862 onward, and which he was able to complete up to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the Acts and the Johannine writings. A condensation of his results respecting the separate books of the New Testament

But as that fundamental view set out with the traditional ideas respecting the origin of the Canon (even to the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews), and in defending them against all criticism never got beyond an unprofitable polemic, nothing but a very subjective mode of reasoning could be employed in carrying them out. This put a self-constructed history of salvation in place of actual historical treatment. Hofmann left behind him a numerous school out of which the works of Th. Schott, Luthardt, Klostermann, and others, as well as the first publications of Spitta have proceeded. In particular, his successor in office, *Theod. Zahn*, in Erlangen has begun a series of learned *Forschungen zur Geschichte des NTlichen Kanon und der altkirchlichen Literatur* (Erlangen, 1881, 83, 84). From the same school also proceeds the *Entwicklungsgeschich. des NTlichen Schriftthums*, Gütersloh, 1871, by *Rud. Friedr. Grau*, in which the organism of New Testament literature is set forth in its development according to the stages of the childhood, youth, and manhood of all literature, stages which are characterized as Epos, Lyric, and Drama, corresponding to the declaratory, epistolary, and prophetic gradation of N. T. Scripture (Apocalypse, Hebrews, Gospel of John). Here we have no longer to do with scientific research, but only with a play of fancy applied to the N. T. writings.²

4. Recently there has also been much contention as to the true problem and method of so-called Introduction. The

was published after his death by W. Volck as Part IX. from manuscripts and lectures (Nördlingen, 1881).

² Compare also Hertwig, *Tabellen zur Einl. ins N. T.*, Berlin, 1849, 4. Aufl., by Weingarten, 1872. The numerous and in many respects learned works of Catholics upon Introduction have not been drawn into the current of the scientific movement, because their result is determined once for all by ecclesiastical authority. Compare Adalbert Maier, *Einl. in die Schriften des N. T.*, Freiburg, 1852; F. X. Reithmayer, *Einl. in die kanonischen Bücher des N. T.*, Regensburg, 1892; Jos. Langen, *Grundriss der Einl. ins N. T.*, Bonn, 1868, 2. Aufl., 1873; M. von Aberle, *Einl. in d. N. T.*, edited by P. Schanz, Freiburg, 1877.

older science of Introduction was not an independent subject born of one fundamental idea and carried out in a connected method, but a science auxiliary to exegesis, to which it furnishes the means for a right understanding of the New Testament and also indirectly for dogmatic also, so far as its aim was to prove that it had its basis in the established Canon. Hence it was interwoven in its origins with hermeneutics, and afterwards with the history and criticism of the text in particular, always with doctrinal investigations of inspiration, canonicity, etc. Schleiermacher still regarded it as a motley collection of prolegomena intended to carry the present reader back to the standpoint of the first readers; while in de Wette's view it was a mass of rudimentary knowledge, devoid of scientific principle or coherence. The treatment of this subject from a purely historical point of view, undertaken by Reuss in accordance with the principles of Hupfeld and Credner (§ 3, 4; note 3), has the great advantage of separating it from all that is not open to examination and presentment by means of the historico-critical method.¹ But the attempt to turn it into a kind of literary history of primitive Christianity, from which the history of the Canon constructs an independent whole, whose fate is then followed up in the history of the text, translation and interpretation of the New Testament, could only be justified if we had to do, to a much greater extent than is the case, with facts that could be ascertained from sources extraneous to those Scriptures whose origin is the very point on which the question turns. Baur is perfectly right in maintaining that in this branch of the subject we have to do, in the first place, with a series of writings as to whose origin and collection definite ideas, which should be critically tested, are assumed

¹ For this reason I deem it unsuitable to characterize an Introduction to the New Testament as historico-critical. That it ought to be so is a matter of course; whether or not it actually is so depends on its method of treatment.

à priori. It cannot be laid down in advance how far this testing leads to a perfectly certain conclusion, or how far the current idea, in case it be proved untenable, can be replaced by a new one with sufficient safety. We must be satisfied in many cases with an indication of the point up to which critical research can advance with security, whilst a history following anticipated results will always be characterized by some amount of uncertainty, and must forfeit its claim to a critical investigation of details.² The origin of the Canon can only in reality be represented in the form of a history imperfectly searched out as to its sources, and must necessarily be first investigated, because the tradition as to the origin of the separate books, which forms the starting-point of all criticism respecting them, can only be rightly estimated in its continuity. It is a mere fiction to assume that the origin of the individual books must be examined before we can proceed to the history of their collection, since in the latter they are looked at not in the light in which they appear as the result of criticism, but as they were viewed at the time of the formation of the Canon. But even the history of the origin of the separate books may be treated from an essentially historical point of view, without giving up our adhesion to the groups of writings handed down in the Canon. The very circumstance that the Pauline epistles are interwoven with the life-history of the great Gentile apostle leads, as a matter of course, to the discussion of all those facts in the history of the apostolic period that may still be determined with historical accuracy, and which form a basis for the criticism of the other N. T. books. Hence

² Compare recent discussion of this subject by Hupfeld, *Ueber Begriff und Methode der sogen. bibl. Einl.*, Marburg, 1844; Rudelbach, in *d. Zeitschr. für luth. Theologie und Kirche*, 1848; Baur, in *d. Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, 51; Ewald, in the *Jahrb. der bibl. Wiss.*, 3. 1851, 4. 1852; Delitzsch, in *d. Zeitsch. für Protestantismus und Kirche*, 1854; Holtzmann, Hupfeld and Riehm, in *d. Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1860, 61, 62; Zahn, *Realencyklop.* IV, 1879.

their treatment must be the starting-point in what goes by the name of special Introduction.³

³ The fact that the history of the Text is usually attached to the history of the Canon has a good reason in the needs of academic instruction ; but all that is commonly imparted respecting the language of the N. T., the preservation of the Text, the manuscripts, versions, recensions, and editions of the Text, has no internal and necessary connection with the origin of the Canon and its constituent parts, and must be definitely excluded from a scientific presentation of them (comp. Zahn, as before). The history of translation and interpretation in its widest sense can be profitably treated only in connection with general Church history.

FIRST PART.

HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

§ 5. THE CANON OF THE LORD'S WORDS.

1. CHRIST has left no written record. He found His nation already in possession of a collection of sacred writings, from which it drew religious knowledge and edification; and He did not come to destroy the law or the prophets (Matt. v. 17). It was not to improve or supplement their doctrines or precepts that He came, but to bring the joyful message of the fulfilment of the promise that had been given to them, and of the final realization of their religious and moral ideal by the consummation of the Divine revelation in Him; a fact which did really open up a newer, fuller understanding of Old Testament revelation. By the revelation of Himself in word and deed, by His self-surrender in suffering and death, by His exaltation and the sending of His spirit, He founded the kingdom of God, and gave security for the infallibly certain development of its aim. For this object a written record would have been as insufficient as it was superfluous.¹ In order to continue His work upon earth, He only needed witnesses to testify what they had seen and heard, preachers of the message of salvation manifested in Him, who could bear witness from inmost experience that He was the promised

¹ The letter of Christ to King Abgarus of Edessa, given by Eusebius, *H. E.*, 1, 13, is of course fictitious. Jesus was certainly far from making any reflections on the superiority of the oral to the written word, or the dangers of bondage to the letter, and such like.

One in whom they had found the fulfilment of all their longing and hope. The apostles whom Jesus had chosen and trained for that purpose were simple men, who could have felt neither inclination nor capacity for literary work (comp. Acts iv. 13), and whom He had certainly chosen without regard to later written productions. Even the culture of Paul, who was called afterwards, was on a Scripture basis. It did not consist in literary skill, but in the capability of understanding and using O. T. Scripture. The commission was one of oral announcement. The activity of the Twelve, which for a long period was limited to Jerusalem, and when further extended could easily be carried on in person, made all written instruction unnecessary. Authorship in the interest of later generations could not occur to a time living in expectation of the immediate return of the Lord. The primitive documents of the apostolic time are concerned throughout only with the speaking and preaching of the word, with its hearing and acceptance.² Comp. Rom. x. 14, 17.

2. The necessity for recourse to written intervention only made itself felt when Christianity extended to wider circles and the apostles were unable to be always present when the need arose for instruction in matters of doctrine, practice, or the Church; for comfort, strengthening, and exhortation. Hence the origin of epistolary literature.¹ But even these

² Only to a later time, that had become fonder of writing, could it occur to explain this on the assumption that they were so taken up with the work of teaching and of preparation for it, that they had no time to spare for writing (comp. *Eclog. ex script. prophet.*, c. 27), or to give their want of literary culture as a reason why they occupied themselves so little with the writing of books (comp. *Euseb., H. E.*, 3, 24).

¹ Whether Paul was the founder of this and the pattern for it, as is generally supposed, can only be determined from the history of the origin of the separate N. T. writings. Paul does not recognise a peculiar gift for writing among the charisms of the apostolic period; and neither he nor the New Testament knows of any other spiritual gift than that which all Christians have.

letters, all of which seem to have been prompted by special occasions, were for the most part entrusted to particular men whose mission it was to supplement and enforce the written word by oral speech. The sole prophetic book of the New Testament is also intentionally clothed in an epistolary form, in order that the prophecy might give consolation and admonition to the Churches for which it was designed. What we know of the origin of the oldest Gospels points to the substitution of written records for oral preaching which had become necessary by the death or removal of the apostles; while the later Gospels give direct expression to the didactic and practical object for which they were designed (Luke i. 4; John xx. 31). In any case the gospel literature came later than the epistolary. Paul knows nothing as yet of written Gospels, but appeals to oral tradition (1 Cor. xv. 3, etc.). The former, like the letters, were certainly intended at first for a smaller circle of readers. The writings of Luke are even addressed to a single man (Luke i. 3; Acts i. 1). The charge given by Paul in his first epistle, that it should be read to all the brethren (1 Thess. v. 27), could only be carried out at a meeting of the Church; but this of course was something quite different from the regular reading of Old Testament Scripture, adopted from the synagogue by the Gentile Christian Churches in their meetings for worship. The sole object in this case was that the letter should be made known to the whole community for whom it was intended (comp. 2 Cor. i. 13). For the same reason Paul gives directions on another occasion that two neighbouring Churches should exchange letters after they had first been publicly read (Col. iv. 16); from which it follows that he had no thought of his letters habitually going beyond the circle of those to whom they were addressed. Doubtless many of the epistles, in particular the so-called Catholic ones, were from the first intended for a wider circle of Churches, and were therefore copied and pretty widely circu-

lated. But so long as the Churches had still the personal presence of the apostles, more or less frequently, there was no intention to spread their writings, much less to make a collection of them.²

3. The writers of the apostolic time, like Jesus Himself, refer to the Old Testament simply as the Scripture. That which is written (*γέγραπται, γεγραμμένον ἐστίν*), or what the Scripture says (*ἡ γραφή λέγει*), is absolute authority as such (comp. Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.'s*, 4. Aufl., 1884, § 74). The ground of this is, that God Himself speaks, who by His Spirit put His word into the mouth of prophets; but it is the Epistle to the Hebrews that first cites the words of Scripture as the words of God, even where the Old Testament does not so characterize them (comp. as before, § 116, c.). What Christ said naturally takes its place beside the word of God in Scripture, since He came in order to complete Old Testament revelation. The writings of the primitive apostolic circle are interwoven with allusions to the words of the Old Testament as the words of the Lord, without, however, the latter being expressly quoted as such, which is indeed seldom the case with the former. There is an express admonition in 2 Pet. iii. 2, *μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου*. Paul appeals repeatedly to the words of the Lord for his statements and directions; but it is in the Acts of the Apostles that he is

² The fact that at a later time, which traced back to the apostolic age everything that had become sacred to it, fixed the New Testament Canon by John, making it end with him (*Phot. Bibl. cod.* 254), is just as conceivable as it is wanting in all historical foundation. So Augusti thought, *Versuch einer hist. dogm. Einl. in d. heil. Schrift*, 1832. But Tischendorf's notion that the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, 1 Pet. and 1 John were collected into the Canon as early as the end of the first century (*Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* Leipz., 1865), and Ewald's hypothesis of a collection of the Pauline Epistles about 100, are fictions entirely unhistorical.

first made to quote the word of the Lord directly.¹ Old Testament Scripture seems also to be the chief authority quoted in very various forms throughout the only extra-canonical writing which certainly belongs to the first century, the Epistle of the Roman to the Corinthian Church, the so-called first Epistle of Clement, where however reference is made in two passages to the words of the Lord, after the manner of the Acts; while the so-called Epistle of Barnabas seems to introduce a similar quotation with the simple word *φησί*, not only in 4, 14 (on this, however, compare No. 6, Note 1), but also in 7, 11, side by side with frequent citations of the Old Testament.²

4. It is certain that until after the middle of the second century no other Canon was set up in the Church than the

¹ Already in 1 Thess. iv. 15 Paul bases a prophecy on the word of the Lord (*ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου*, comp. Matt. xxiv. 31; comp. also v. 2 with Matt. xxxiv. 43), the summing up of the law in the command to love one another he characterizes as the law of Christ (Gal. vi. 2), and expressly makes a distinction between his own directions (vii. 12, 25) and the word of the Lord with respect to divorce, giving the meaning of the latter in an indirect way (1 Cor. vii. 10; comp. Mark x. 9). Speaking of the right of the preacher of the gospel to be supported by the Church, founded on the Old Testament, he says in 1 Cor. ix. 14: *οὕτως καὶ ὁ κύριος διέταξεν*, for which reason the word of the Lord here referred to, Luke x. 7, may also be directly attached to the Old Testament Scripture (1 Tim. v. 18) on which that right is based. Comp. also the words of the institution of the Lord's supper, 1 Cor. xi. 24 f. In Acts xx. 35, in the farewell discourse at Miletus, we are first told: *ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν, ὅτι . . . δεῖ . . . μνημονεύειν τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν μακαρίων ἐστὶν μᾶλλον δίδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν*. This word of the Lord has not been preserved in our written Gospels, nor can I find any reminiscence of it in the passage 1 Clem. ad Corinth. 2, 1 (*ἡδίων διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες*), where the similarity of wording is conditioned by the context.

² In the passage 1 Clem. ad Cor. 13, 1, etc., we read: *ποιήσωμεν τὸ γεγραμμένον*, after which an O. T. passage is introduced with the words *λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα* followed by *μάλιστα μνησθέντες τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδάσκων—οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν*, and Chap. 46, 7, etc.: *μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν· εἶπεν γὰρ*. Whether the Epistle of Barnabas belongs to the first century, is indeed very doubtful; but it must at least be the oldest monument of the second century that has come down to us.

Word of God, *i.e.* no other normal authority that could take its place beside the Word of God in the Old Testament. Though not expressly put forward in the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Ignatian Epistles*, yet in *Polycarp*, ad Phil. 2, 3, we find words of the Lord introduced with the same formula as in 1 Clem. 13.¹ But such allusion is particularly prominent in the Homily commonly called the *Second Epistle of Clement* to the Corinthians. Here again we find continual exhortation to consider and fulfil the ἐντολαὶ τοῦ κυρίου which are introduced by λέγει ὁ κύριος.² In like manner the recently discovered Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων (comp. Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Bd. II. 1, 2; Leipzig, 1884), expressly calls itself διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων. Just as an O. T. passage 16, 7 is introduced by the words ὡς ἐρρήθη (comp. 14, 3), so in 9, 5 we read, περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος. The whole burden of the work is an exhortation to do ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος (8, 2). *Papias of Hierapolis* begins by writing five books, ἃ ἐπικαλεῖται λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις (Euseb., *H. E.*, 39), because everything depends on the understanding of these regulating words of the Lord. In *Justin the Martyr* we find a clear enunciation of the principle that the authority of Christ stands side by side with that of the

¹ That the passage Herm. Vis. ii. 2, 8: ἄμωσεν κύριος κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἀρνησαμένους τὸν κύριον αὐτῶν ἀπεγνωρισθαι ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν refers to Matt. x. 33, is quite improbable. A writing professedly apocalyptic had, moreover, less motive for such appeal to the words of the Lord, and with the exception of the obscure ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδὰδ καὶ Μωδὰτ (Vis. ii. 3, 4) it contains indeed no O. T. citations. In Ign. ad Smyrn. 3, 2, an utterance of Christ is referred to only in an historical way; but on the other hand we read in Pol. 2, 3: μνημονεύοντες ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων, comp. also 7, 2: καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος, which explains also δὲ ἂν μεθοδεύη τα λογία τοῦ κυρίου, etc. (7, 1).

² In 2 Clement 17, 3, we read: μνημονεύμεν τῶν τοῦ κυρίου ἐνταλμάτων —πειρώμεθα προκόπτειν ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς τοῦ κυρίου, which by their connection with 3, 4; 6, 7; 8, 4 are without doubt the commands of Christ. Comp. the frequent citations beginning with εἶπεν ὁ κύριος (4, 5; 9, 11), λέγει ὁ κύριος (5, 2; 6, 1) and suchlike.

prophetic word.³ *Hegesippus*, too, makes it the criterion of orthodoxy that everything should be so regulated, ὡς ὁ νόμος κηρύσσει καὶ οἱ προφήται καὶ ὁ κύριος (Euseb., *H. E.*, 4, 22), in accordance with the word of the Old Testament and of Christ (comp. Steph Gobar. in *Phot. Bibl.*, 232, p. 288:—τῶν τε θείων γραφῶν καὶ τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος). Just in proportion as the Church of the second century was accustomed to regard Christianity as a new law on the observance of which salvation depended, was it natural for it to look on the words of the Lord especially the commands regulating the life of the Christian, as its guiding principle. In any case the want of a proper guide was by no means felt so long as men were satisfied with the simplest elements of evangelical preaching, and assumed their common possession to be a thing intelligible of itself.

5. Our written Gospels were by no means the exclusive, or even the principal source from which these regulating words of the Lord were drawn. It is certain that they are not the source from which Paul's references are drawn; and Papias in looking after τὰς παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύοντες, is of opinion οὐ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσούτον ὠφελεῖν, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης (Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 39). In his time there was still, therefore, a living oral tradition respecting these words of the Lord. Hence in Barnabas (7, 11), Ignatius (ad Smyrn. 3), 2 Clement (12, 2, ff.), as well as in Acts xx. 35, we find words of the Lord

³ Thus we read in Apol. i. 6: (θεόν) καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα—πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνούμεν; comp. 1, 13: τὸν διδάσκαλον—Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν—ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες, πνεῦμά τε προφητικὸν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει. The Christians are μαθητὲς παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν προελθόντων αὐτοῦ προφητῶν (i. 23). In Dial. 48 we read: οὐκ ἀνθρωπιεῖς διδάγμασι κεκελεύσμεθα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πείθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς διὰ τῶν μακαρίων προφητῶν κηρυχθεῖσι καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ διδασχθεῖσι, comp. Dial. 139: ἐγνωκότες τὴν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀλήθειαν. But we shall have to speak of Justin more fully in another connection (§ 7), and only mention him here, inasmuch as this oldest Canon of the Church finds expression in him also.

that are preserved nowhere else, or, though met with in heretical Gospels whose origin and age we do not know, cannot in any case have been taken from our Gospels. The fact of quotation from memory may always serve to explain many deviations, while much confusion of memory is doubtless due to the similarity of the Gospel parallels; but the great arbitrariness in reproducing, mixing and connecting the words of the Lord at this time, can only be explained by the manifold variations in which oral tradition was still accustomed to reproduce them. Thus the two oldest citations in Clement are thrown together out of entirely different words of the Lord, scarcely one of which is in complete agreement with passages in the Gospels.¹ Fabulous adornment of the narrative respecting the star that appeared to the wise men, such as we meet with in Ignatius (*ad Eph.* 19), certainly presupposes no evangelical source; and when Eusebius (*H. E.*, 3, 39) found the history of the great adulteress, narrated by Papias, in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, it does not by any means follow that he borrowed it from this. In the second Epistle of Clement, 5, 2, ff., two quite distinct utterances of Christ are transformed and brought into connection by an intervening question of Peter, while the citation 4, 5 is so freely handled as to be almost unrecognisable.² The *Didache*, too, indulges in the most won-

¹ The view that such words must therefore proceed from uncanonical Gospels, finds no support even in the fact that similar combinations and modes of expression recur in other authors, since they may equally be explained from stereotyped forms of transmission or from the dependence of one author on another. Hence the relative similarity of citations in *Polyc.* 2, 3 and *1 Clem.* 13, 2, may doubtless be explained on the assumption that the author of Polycarp's Epistle was acquainted with the Epistle of Clement, as the very introductory formula shows.

² Quite in a similar way Luke has often enough united by means of questions of transition, words and series of words lying before him in his sources. But here a prophecy is made in 5, 2, taken solely from Luke x. 3; and in 5, 4 the passage Luke xii. 4 f., with the meaning of which Matthew also agrees, has a reminiscence of the former simile. Moreover, the question of Peter may be explained as a reference to *Matt.* xvii.

derful mixings and combinations of the words of the Lord (1, 3; 1, 4, etc.; 16, 1), and at the very outset gives a negative interpretation to Matt. vii. 12, which though it misses the germ of the thought of Christ, was popularly current among Jews and Gentiles. Chap. 2-5 consists almost as exclusively of words taken from the Epistle of Barnabas, as Chap. 1 of evangelical utterances, the Didache assuming without question that the work in its series of exhortations contained the Lord's words orally transmitted and freely shaped, but still transmitted in their essence. This view, indeed, is by no means without some foundation where many of the sayings of Barnabas are concerned, as well as those of Clement and Hermas, even where they do not profess to be the Lord's words.

6. After all that has been said, there can be no thought of a Canon of the Gospels, *i.e.* of a closed collection of evangelical books equal to those of the Old Testament in consequence and import. Moreover the *ὡς γεγράφται* in Barn. 4, 14 cannot possibly prove the canonical validity of the Gospel of Matthew; and it is highly improbable that even in 2 Clem. 2, 4 the Gospels are considered as *γραφή*.¹ Nor do the Ig-

31, 33. And 4, 5 is only a very free transformation of the utterance contained in Luke xiii. 26 f. which from the individual case here put (*ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν*), rises to the universal proposition, that even the closest union with Christ (*μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου*) is no protection against being cast away.

¹ If Barnabas does actually contain a reference to Matt. xxii. 14, the *ὡς γεγράφται* can only prove a canonical validity of this word of the Lord equivalent to that of Old Testament Scripture, but not to that of the work from which it is borrowed, especially since the saying is not quoted at all but only interwoven in the context: *προσέχωμεν μήποτε, ὡς γεγράφται, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ εὐρεθῶμεν*. But it is just as likely that the author, who quotes from memory, was in error in supposing the saying to be taken from O. T. Scripture; for it is most improbable that the reference is to 4 Esdr. viii. 3. We can scarcely doubt that this is the case in 2 Clem. 2, 4, where the passage Matt. ix. 13 is introduced by *καὶ ἕτερα δὲ γραφή λέγει* and the connection with 2, 5 f. shows that this is looked upon as a word of God that

nation epistles contain any reference to written Gospels, but τὸ εὐαγγέλιον after the manner of the New Testament points to the oral preaching of the Apostles, as in 1 Clem. 47, 2; Barn. 5, 9, of which Polycarp (ad Phil. 6, 3), as well as 1 Clem. 42, 1; Barn. 8, 3, uses the term εὐαγγελίζεσθαι.¹ Papias of Hierapolis is the first to speak of books (βιβλία), from which the commands of the Lord may be known, and tells how Mark τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα ἀκριβῶς ἔγρα-

only found its fulfilment in Christ. 13, 4 is also a sentence formed out of Luke vi. 27, 32, and quoted as a word of God, i.e. as an O. T. saying, as well as 15, 3. On the contrary it seems to me that 2 Clem. 3, 5 ascribes to Christ Himself the saying from Isaiah employed by him in Matt. xv. 8; and the designation of O. T. quotations as words of the Lord (13, 2; 17, 4) may rest upon such interchange. Also in Barnabas 7, 11 (comp. No. 5) an interchange with Acts xiv. 22 is not excluded. But even in one like Justin, who was much better acquainted with Scripture, not only do frequent interchanges occur of the prophets quoted (*Apol.* i., 35, 51, 53; *Dial.* 14, 49), but also intermixture of the words of the Lord in O. T. citations (*Apol.* i., 48; *Isa.* xxxv. 4 ff.; comp. *Matt.* xi. 5; i. 51; *Dan.* vii. 13, comp. *Matt.* xxv. 31), and in the midst of a series of the Lord's words, *Dial.* 35, a sentence is inserted which can only arise out of a reminiscence of 1 Cor. xi. 18 f. (*ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἰρέσεις*).

¹ When we read in Ign. (ad Philad. 5, 1): *προσφυγῶν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκλησίας*, it is fruitless to try to find in the passage a reference to the Gospel-Canon in contradistinction from the Apostolic writings. For when we read immediately after that the prophets εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατηγορεῖσθαι and this gospel is designated as τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος (5, 2), and the παρουσία, the suffering and resurrection of Christ, is termed the ἐξάλυτον of it (9, 2, comp. ad Smyrn. 7, 2) which the prophets announced, it is clear that the oral message of salvation delivered by the Apostles is here meant. But the ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ in 8, 2, which Zahn (*Ignatius von Antiochen*, Gotha, 1873) takes as apposition to ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις cannot then be the written Gospel, as he supposes, since the opponent says he does not believe in the message of salvation when he does not find in the O. T. documents what it announces. But it is certain that the author opposes his γέγραπται to him, from the fact that according to ad Eph. 5, 3, ad Magn. 22 it unquestionably refers to the O. T. Scriptures. In Polycarp (ad Phil. 6, 3), the Apostles are called οἱ εὐηγγελισμένοι ἡμᾶς. Why in the second Epistle of Clement and in the Didache the use of language is already different, we shall see later on (comp. § 7, 1, note 3).

ψεν; and how Matthew made a collection of τὰ λόγια in the Hebrew language (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 39). That he was acquainted also with our Greek Matthew and Luke, is at least very probable; and the fact that he tells nothing of the origin of the latter certainly does not prove, as Hilgenfeld assumes, that he rejects it. But the very way in which he speaks of the literary origin of two of the Gospels and criticizes their peculiarities, shows how far he was from regarding them as inspired or canonical works. In order to ascertain how far our written Gospels were known to other writers before the middle of the second century, it is necessary to consider not only the words of the Lord which they expressly quote, but also their allusions to such words in their works. But since they nowhere attach value to a definite form of expression, and we have to take into account not only the written Gospels but also the oral tradition in many cases fixed by these, it is difficult to establish a knowledge of any one Gospel with certainty. It is only natural that we should find most agreement between those two Gospels that are richest in the Lord's words, especially since both contain the Sermon on the Mount, out of which the new law as it was given by the Lord has always with propriety been taken. Yet the form of the words as given by Matthew is so preponderating in Clement that it may justly be doubted whether he was acquainted with Luke's Gospel, and even in Barnabas nothing compels us to go beyond Matthew.³ In Ignatius and Polycarp themselves no trace of

³ The enlargement which Matt. vii. 1, etc. has received in 1 Clem. 13, 2, refers back in the commencement to Matt. v. 7; vi. 14, and there is in the *ὡς χρηστεύεσθε* (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 4) *οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται* an expression so foreign to our written Gospels, that it is very doubtful whether the *ὡς διδοτε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν* must be referred to Luke vi. 38. The citation 46, 8 is fully explained by a combination of Matt. xxvi. 24 and xviii. 6. To draw a conclusion from the form of the citation of Isaiah xxix. 13 (1 Clem. 15, 2), as to an acquaintance with Mark vii. 9 (comp. Harnack, Holtzmann), is still very precarious. In

Luke's text appears, a fact which forms the stronger testimony to the predominance of the Matthew type, because they, as well as Barnabas, show that they were already acquainted with the Acts.⁴ Not till the second Epistle of Clement (4, 5; 5, 2; 4; 6, 1, comp. also 12, 2) and the Didache (1, 3; 4; 5; 16, 1) does the influence of Luke's Gospel on the form of the Lord's words indubitably appear. In Hermas there is no certain trace of the two Gospels, but an unmistakable echo of Mark x. 24, etc. (Sim. ix. 20, 2 f.; comp. also v. 2, 6 with Mark xii. 6, ff.; Mand. iv. 1, 6, 10 with Mark x. 11 f), and the *eis τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον χωρήσει* in Ignatius ad Eph. 16, 2, has a reminiscence of Mark ix. 43.

7. When the Gospel of John appeared, in the last decade of the first century, about the same time as the first Epistle of Clement, the oral tradition of the Lord's words had already for more than twenty years borne the impress given to it by the older evangelical writings scattered throughout the Churches, especially our Gospel of Matthew. The current idea of the Lord's words could neither be changed nor modified by that of John's Gospel which was in many re-

Barnabas we find, besides reminiscences of Matt. xxi. 14 (4, 14), only a few allusions to the narrative of the gospel history (5, 9; 7, 9; 12, 10), which are sufficiently explained by Matt., and the *ἐπορίζετο δεξιὰ καὶ ἄριστεν* (7, 3) certainly shows an acquaintance with our first Gospel. The *εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ κοινωνοὶ ἐστέ, πῶς μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς φθαρτοῖς* (19, 8) is originally a transformation or imitation of Luke xvi. 11 f., but was not necessarily made by Barnabas.

⁴ Comp. Barn. 19, 8: *κοινωνήσεις ἐν πᾶσι τῷ πλησίον σου, καὶ οὐκ ἐρείς ἴδια εἶναι* with Acts iv. 32 (comp. also No. 6, note 1); Ignat. ad Smyrn. 3, 3: *μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν* with Acts x. 41; Pol. ad Phil. 1, 2: *ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ θεὸς λύσας τὰς ὠδύνας τοῦ ἄδου* with Acts ii. 24. An allusion to Acts iv. 12 in Herm. Vis. iv. 2, 4: *δὲ οὐδενὸς δύνῃ σωθῆναι εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ μεγ. καὶ ἐνδύξου ὀνόματος* is not so certain (comp. also Sim. ix. 23, 5, with Acts v. 41). On the other hand, for the appearance of Christ mentioned in Ign. ad Smyrn. 3, 2, we must go back, by reason of what we know of the Lord's word from other sources, to oral tradition and not to Luke xxiv. 36 ff.

spects so singular, nor did the words of the Lord peculiar to it offer such concrete ἐντολαί as were at that time looked for in them. Nevertheless we find that from the beginning this very Gospel produced a more powerful and universal effect on the authors of the second century than any other N. T. writing, not indeed by means of isolated words of the Lord, but by its whole theological and literary peculiarity, and therefore more or less in connection with the contemporaneous Johannine Epistles. Already in the *Epistle of Barnabas* the ἐλθεῖν ἐν σαρκί (5, 10, etc., comp. 1 John iv. 2) and the φανεροῦσθαι of Christ (6, 7; 9, comp. 1 John i.; ii. 3; v. 8), his κατοικεῖν ἐν ἡμῖν (6, 14, comp. Gosp. i. 14) and his κατακεντᾶσθαι (7, 9, comp. Gosp. xix. 34, 37), the comparison with the brazen serpent (12, 5 ff., comp. Gosp. iii. 14) and his ἀναβαίνειν after the φανέρωσις on the day of resurrection (15, 9, comp. Gosp. xx. 17; xxi. 1) point to the Johannine writings. Even in the *Shepherd of Hermas* Christ is the πύλη and the only access to the Father (Sim. ix. 12, 5 f.), He gives the law that He has received from His Father (Sim. v. 6, 3), and His commands are not difficult (Mand. xii. 3, 5). The necessary connection between the knowledge of God and the ἀγαθοποιεῖν is developed in Sim. ix. 18, 1 f. in true Johannine fashion.¹ In the Ignatian

¹ Already in Sim. ix. 12, 1 the Son of God is called the πύλη (comp. Gosp. x. 9, ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσελθῆ σωθήσεται), and in 12, 5 we read εἰς τὴν βασιλ. τ. θεοῦ ἄλλως εἰσελθεῖν οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος (comp. Gosp. iii. 5) εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (comp. also 16, 5, and with it 1 John iii. 23; v. 13). With 12, 6: αὕτη μὲν εἰσοδὸς ἐστὶ πρὸς τὸν κύριον· ἄλλως οὖν οὐδεὶς εἰσελεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, comp. Gosp. xiv. 6. With Sim. v. 6, 3: δοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸν νόμον ὃν ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ comp. Gosp. x. 18: ταύτην ἐντολήν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου and with the preceding καθαρῶς τὰς ἀμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ comp. 1 John i. 7, 9. With Mand. xii. 3, 5 (τὰς ἐντολὰς ταύτας) φυλάττει καὶ οὐκ ἔσονται σκληραὶ comp. 1 John v. 3: αἱ ἐντολαὶ αὐτοῦ βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσὶν and with the expression σκληρός, Gosp. vi. 60. With Sim. ix. 18, 1, etc., comp. 1 John ii. 3, etc., and with the expression κόλασις, 1 John iv. 18; ἀγαθοποιεῖν, 3 John 11. Further information will be found in Zahn (*Der Hirte des Hermas*, Gotha, 1868), and Holtzmann, who is inclined however to

Epistles the Son of God is already termed αὐτοῦ λόγος—ὁς κατὰ πάντα εὐηρέστησεν τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν (ad Magn. 8, 2, comp. Gosp. i. 1; viii. 29), He was πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρί (ad Magn. 7, 1, comp. Gosp. i. 2; xvii. 5), He did nothing without the Father, ἠνωμένος ὢν (ad Magn. 7, 1, comp. Gosp. v. 19; x. 30; xvii. 22). Here too He is called ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός and ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή (ad Eph. 5, 2; comp. Gosp. i. 1, 14; 1 John v. 20); here too θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς (ad Philad. 9, 1; comp. Gosp. x. 9). As the σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χρ. is called ἄρτος θεοῦ (ad Rom. 7, 3; comp. Gosp. vi. 33, 51), so His blood is a πόμα (Gosp. vi. 55). If we add to these the constant designation of the devil as ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, and the expression ὕδωρ ζῶν (ad Rom. 7, 2), both peculiarly Johannine, besides μένειν ἐν Χριστ. (ad Eph. 10, 3; comp. ad Magn. 13, 1: ἐν νύῳ καὶ πατρί), as well as the evident reference to John iii. 8 (ad Philad. 7, 1; comp. also the Johannine ἐλέγχω), they certainly show a knowledge of John's Gospel, as even Holtzmann admits. While no reminiscences of the Gospel are to be found in Polycarp, 7, 1 begins with a sentence almost every word of which is to be found in 1 John iv. 2, etc. (comp. 2 John 7), and bears a stamp so characteristically Johannine that the pretext of a *locus communis* or a borrowing from Polycarp is *à priori* excluded. Papias too, according to Eusebius (*H. E.*, 3, 39), has made use of passages from the first Epistle of John; in the fragment of his preface there preserved, he calls Christ αὐτὴ ἡ ἀλήθεια (comp. Gosp. xiv. 6); among the Apostles enumerated he names first the three that are named in the beginning of John's Gospel (i. 41, 44), together with Thomas, who plays a part only in it; and when he names John and Matthew last among the Apostles whose utterances he sought out, he must have been acquainted with the former's written record of the Lord's

give the priority to Hermas here also, as he does decidedly in the case of Barnabas (*Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 1871, 3), while even Wittichen and Keim admit that both were acquainted with John.

words, as it can be proved he was with those of the latter, and must therefore have had least need to investigate their oral statements on this point.¹ In the *second Epistle of Clement* we find the *σὰρξ ἐγένετο* taken from John i. 14 (9, 5), and the *ἀρνεῖσθαι δι' οὗ ἔγνωμεν αὐτὸν (τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας)* 3, 1 reminds us the more of 1 John ii. 23, since the *γνώσκοντες τὸν θεόν* are there in true Johannine phraseology called *οἱ ζῶντες* (comp. also 17, 1, and with it Gosp. xvii. 3). But we are also frequently reminded of John by the use of *ζωή* and *φῶς*, *θάνατος* and *ὁ κόσμος οὗτος*, *νικᾶν* and *μισεῖν*, while the *παράκλητος*, 6, 9, recalls 1 John ii. 1.² Finally, while the words of the Lord in the Didache are in no case borrowed from John's Gospel, the eucharistic prayers in chap. 9, 10 are replete with Johannine ideas and expressions, such as *ζωή καὶ γνώσις* (9, 3), *γνώσις καὶ πίστις*

¹ The preface of an evangelical manuscript of the 9th century (comp. Aberle, *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1864; Zahn, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1867) does not suffice to prove that he imparted knowledge respecting the origin of John's Gospel as well as concerning Matthew and Mark, nor does the silence of Eusebius, who regarded its origin as universally known and recognised, prove the contrary; but it is scarcely probable, since this Gospel was certainly well enough known in his circle. That in his exegeses of the words of the Lord he neither explained nor made use of any Johannine saying of Christ, does not however follow from Eusebius, who never thinks it necessary to prove the early use of John's Gospel, while he did regard it as a matter of importance to prove the early attestation of the two Homologoumena among the Catholic Epistles. But when Irenæus gives an explanation of John xiv. 2 from the mouth of the presbyter contemporary with Papias, and a view of the age of Jesus, which, if it is to be attested by the Gospel, can only rest on a misinterpretation of John viii. 57 (*adv. Hær.*, v. 36, 2; ii. 22, 6), it is an additional proof of the knowledge and use of John's Gospel at the time of Papias.

² While Holtzmann (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1877) maintains that on closer examination these points of contact disappear, he emphasizes the points of contact between 1 Clem. and the Johannine writings, although a glance at the connection shows how very differently the former employs *ἐργάζεσθαι ἔργον* (33, 8), *ποιεῖν ἀλήθειαν* (31, 2), the connection of *τελειοῦσθαι* with *ἀγάπη* (49, 5; 50, 3) of *πιστός* and *δίκαιος* (27, 1; 60, 1), and although he himself refers to 1 Thess. i. 9 for *ἀληθινὸς θεός*. But it is a strange fancy that the relation of the apostles to Christ (42, 1; 2) is said to contain a specific Johannine element.

καὶ ἀθανασία (10, 2), ἄμπελος Δαβίδ (9, 2, comp. Gosp. xv.). In particular we are reminded of the prayer in John xvii., by the expressions πάτερ ἅγιε, το ὄνομα σου, ἐγνωρίσας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ (10, 2, comp. 9, 2 f.), τελείωσαι, ἁγιασθῆναι (10, 5), and ἐγένετο ἐν (9, 4). Hence it is most probable that these prayers were not freely composed, but refer to a liturgical usage already fixed; and the more certainly do they prove how early and how extensively the Johannine writings had influenced the life of the Church.

§ 6. THE OLDEST TRACES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
EPISTLES.

1. When Paul first began to write, he occasionally enjoined upon his Churches to hold fast that which he had taught them in the name and spirit of Christ, whether orally or in writing (2 Thess. ii. 15), and afterwards spoke of obedience to his written instructions (2 Cor. ii. 9; vii. 15). Jude 17 contains a reference to an oral prophecy of the apostles of our Lord. But only once in the New Testament are Apostolic (Pauline) Epistles mentioned, where a warning is given against intentionally misinterpreting them (2 Pet. iii. 15 f.). And throughout the whole pre-Justinian age we only meet with mention of Apostolic (Pauline) Epistles where a writing to the Churches that had received these Epistles, gave special occasion for such mention. Thus in 1 Clem. 47, 2 an Epistle to the Corinthians is mentioned, and in Polycarp 3, 2, the Epistle to the Philippians.¹ Hence it appears that these Epistles were still regarded as the exclusive property of individual Churches, and for this very reason there can be no thought of their possessing regulative validity in the Church, or having been collected into an epistolary Canon. When in 1 Clem. 47, 1 the Corinthians

¹ The *ὅς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν* in Ign. ad Eph. 12, 2 cannot here be considered, since the transmitted text is quite unintelligible.

are called upon to take up again (*ἀναλάβετε*) the Epistle of Paul, because he treats of similar improprieties to those which disturbed the Church at that time (47, 3 f.), when Polycarp 3, 2 says: *εἰς ἃς ἐὰν (not ὅταν) ἐγκύπτῃτε, δυνήσεθε οἰκοδομείσθαι*, it follows directly from these passages that a regular (ecclesiastical) reading of the apostolic epistles was not thought of that time. Citation of an epistolary passage (1 Cor. vi. 2) occurs first in the Epistle of Polycarp and in it alone, at least according to the old translation; but it is introduced with the very artless expression *ut Paulus docet*, showing that it has by no means an authority analogous to that of Scripture (11, 2).² All this is the more significant, since from the first no doubt existed as to the unique importance of the apostles, on the ground of their relation to Christ. The entrusting to them of the message of salvation proceeds from Christ, just as the sending of Christ proceeds from God (1 Clem. 42, 1 f.). The unique authorization of the Twelve to preach the message of salvation (Barn. 8, 3) rests on the fact of their having been chosen for this purpose (5, 9). But although the Epistle of Clement lays great stress on their spiritual preparation for the office, yet at the same time it expressly maintains the universal communication of the Spirit, which gives equal authority to the exhortation of every teacher who is filled with the Spirit.³ Hence the Shepherd of Hermas can class the apostles with

² In Pol. 12, 1, where we read but only in a translation, *ut his scripturis dictum est*, the passage in Eph. iv. 26 is not meant, since the intervening *et* shows that the author thought of two different passages of Scripture. In that case Deut. xxiv. 15 occurred to his memory as Scripture in the second half of the verse, just as he actually quoted from Scripture in the first half (Ps. iv. 5). Comp. § 5, 6, note 1.

³ The apostles went forth at the command of Christ, with a joy in believing imparted by the Holy Spirit, to announce that the kingdom of God was at hand (1 Clem. 42, 3); by the same Spirit they were empowered to arrange the affairs of the Church (42, 4; *δοκιμάσαντες πνεύματι*); and what Paul said to the Corinthians *ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν* (47, 3) must always be heard again. But a *πλήρης*

the first generation of teachers who by the unanimity of their teaching have founded the unity of the Church (Vis. iii. 5, 1), and the number is thus fixed at forty (Sim. ix. 15, 4). They first received the Holy Ghost, which remained inseparably with them and fitted them for their work (15, 6), the work of making known the name of the Son of God to all the world, and in the teaching of the Divine word (16, 5; 25, 2). In the Didache also the apostolic office is regarded as still existing.

2. It is true that the Church, when threatened with serious errors in life and doctrine, which the simple words of the Lord were not able to combat, was accustomed to put the authority of the apostles on a par with these (Ign. ad Mag. 13, 1: τὰ δόγματα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, comp. ad Trall. 7, 1: ἀχωρίστοις θεοῦ Ἰησ. Χρ. καὶ τ. ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν διαταγμάτων τ. ἀποστ., Pol. ad Phil. 6, 3: καθὼς αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο καὶ οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμᾶς ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφήται); their authority is even indirectly put on a par with that of the Old Testament, as the words of Christ only are elsewhere put (2 Clem. 14, 2: τὰ βιβλία καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι).¹ This does not of course imply an independent authority in addition to that of the Lord, but one that has its warrant from Him and is by Him enabled to exercise its functions; but neither does it imply an authority limited to the further inculcation

πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐκχυσις ἐπὶ πάντας ἐγένετο (2, 2, comp. 46, 6); hence the Epistle of Clement freely characterizes his words as τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (τ. θεοῦ) δι' ἡμῶν εἰρημένα (comp. 59, 1, τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν γεγραμμένοις διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος 63, 2). The Epistle of Barnabas likewise speaks of an indwelling of the Divine Logos or Spirit in all believers (16, 8 f.; 19, 7), and similarly Hermas (Mand. iii. 1 f.).

¹ It is in harmony with this that the persons of the Apostles tower above all inspired teachers of the present. Ignatius, as bishop, does indeed speak *φωνῇ θεοῦ* (ad Phil. 7, 1; comp. ad Trall. 7, 1); but already, ad Rom. 4, 3, we read *οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν*, comp. ad Trall. 3, 3; Pol. ad Phil. 3, 2: *οὔτε ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὁμοίος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθήσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τ. μακ. κ. ἐνδ. Παύλου*, and the Ephesians are said to be happy in having the apostles always in their midst, especially Paul the Martyr (Ign. ad Eph.) 11. 2; 12, 2.

of that which had been commanded by the Lord Himself during His life on earth. When a writing professes to be a διδαχὴ τοῦ κυρίου, and enters so minutely into the details of later ecclesiastical relations and arrangements of worship, it cannot pretend that all its appointments are direct injunctions of the Lord, but only aims at showing how the Apostles arranged these things in the name and spirit of Christ. But this apostolic authority is, notwithstanding, a purely ideal force, so to speak. The views and ordinances already adopted by the Church are in fact simply assumed to have their origin in the apostles, and through them in Christ as the ὁ ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραθεὶς ἡμῖν λόγος (Pol. ad Phil. 7, 2). But the need of establishing by documentary evidence that which had been transmitted by the apostles, was not yet felt. Hence the peculiar phenomenon that reference is only incidentally made (comp. No. 1) to the apostolic epistles, while there is no thought of their use as authoritative works. Even 2 Clem. 14, 2 contains no reference to the apostolic writings, as Holtzmann still maintains. It is obvious that where known they were much read, while increasing weight was attached to their thoughts and modes of expression, as we have already seen to be the case with the Johannine writings (§ 5, 7), and as happens frequently with extra-canonical books; but they are not quoted.²

3. It is always of much interest to follow up the literary relations between the so-called apostolic Fathers and the New Testament writings. But even where such can be shown to exist, they naturally prove nothing for the genuineness or

² It is a matter of great difficulty to determine where amid the many points of contact between the post-apostolic literature and that of the New Testament, a literary relation may with certainty be accepted. The collectanea of editors and the compilations specially occupied with this question are very much in want of critical sifting. Comp. Lardner, "The Credibility of the Gospel History," translated from the English, 1750, 71. Kirohhofer, *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des N. Testamentlichen Kanon*, Zürich, 1844.

canonicity of these works; yet they testify to their existence and open up a view into the range of their circulation and usefulness. It only follows from this that we cannot prove the use of such a writing, but by no means that it was not in existence and unknown. The *First Epistle of Clement* points directly to the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians in its detailed description of the state of parties (chap. 47), and contains in chap. 49 a plain imitation of the Pauline psalm of love (1 Cor. xiii.).¹ It is the more striking that 1 Clem. 47, 1 speaks of the Epistle to the Corinthians, as if there were no second, and that in fact no certain reminiscence of it can be shown. The copying of the catalogue of vice (i. 29-32) in 35, 5 sufficiently proves a knowledge of the Epistle to the Romans, although only isolated phrases recall the rest of its contents.² Of the Captivity Epistles, Clement is acquainted with those to the Ephesians and Philippians, although we have only *one* certain echo of each; of the Pastoral Epistles, First Timothy and Titus.³ But the strongest

¹ Comp. also the phrase *ζητεῖν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ* from 1 Cor. x. 24 in 48, 6. We are reminded of the enumeration of gifts in 1 Cor. xii. 8 ff., by 48, 5, and still more clearly of the allegory of the body and its members in xii. 21 ff., by 37, 4 f. However freely the figure of the seed-corn as a type of the resurrection is carried out, 24, 4 f., yet the designation of Christ as the *ἀπαρχή* of the resurrection (24, 1), and the repeated though quite independent application of the *ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι* (37, 3; 41, 1) shows a reminiscence of 1 Cor. xv., especially as the phrase in Clement 63, 1 applies *τὸν τόπον ἀναπληροῦν* (1 Cor. xiv. 16) in a peculiar way.

² Comp. 51, 3, *ὡν τὸ κρίμα πρόδηλον ἐγενήθη* with Rom. iii. 8; 3, 4. *θάνατος εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον* with v. 12; 32, 2, *ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* with ix. 5; 40, 1, *τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως* with xi. 33; 46, 7, *μέλη ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων* with xii. 5; and the phrase *ὑποθεῖναι τὸν πράχλον* 63, 1, which indeed is again applied differently, with xvi. 4.

³ In Clement 46, 6 *μία κλήσις* is named together with "one God, one Christ, and one Spirit" (Eph. iv. 4-6) as constituting the unity of the Church; and in 47, 2 occurs *ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* out of Phil. iv. 15. Yet the thought in 16, 2 always recalls Phil. ii. 6, and the *εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους* which contradicts the mode of expression elsewhere used in the Epistle, recalls Phil. 1, 1. The *ἀγὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας ἀρόντες πρὸς αὐτόν*, 29, 1, is plainly an imitation of 1 Tim. ii. 8 (comp. also

leaning is upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, from which i. 3-13 is copied in 36, 2-4, chap. xi. in chaps. 9-12, 17, etc. (comp. also chap. 45), xii. 1 in 19, 1, etc. It is therefore unnecessary to refer to such resemblances as that of 27, 2 to Heb. vi. 18, or to the conception of Christ as a high priest (comp. especially 36, 1 with Heb. iv. 15, etc.), or that of the spirit as πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος (46, 6, comp. Heb. x. 29). Finally, an acquaintance with the *First Epistle of Peter* may be inferred with certainty from the passage ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ σκοτίου εἰς φῶς, 59, 2 (comp. 2, 9), from phrases such as τιμὴν ἀποιέμεν (1, 3), τίμον αἷμα (7, 4), κραταιὰ χεῖρ (28, 2; 60, 3), παντὸς πνεύματος ἐπίσκοπον (59, 3; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 25), from the Petrine quotations of Prov. iii. 34; x. 12 (30, 2; 49, 4), from the πληθυνθεία of the introductory greeting, and many expressions peculiar only to the Epistle of Peter, such as ἀγαθοποιία, ἀπροσωπολήπτως, ὑπογραμμός, which in 16, 17, as in Peter, contain a reference to Isa. liii. On the other hand no palpable trace of the second Epistle is to be found, not even in the μεγαλοπρεπῆς δόξα, 9, 2, or in 11, 1 comp. with 2 Pet. ii. 9.

4. In *Barnabas* echoes of Paul are very scanty. Yet the πατέρα ἐθνῶν τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας, 13, 7, shows an acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans (iv. 11); the ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ, 3, 6, and ἡμέραι πονηραὶ, 2, 1, recall Eph. i. 6; v. 16, and the ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα καὶ εἰς αὐτόν, 12, 7, reminds us of Col. i. 16. On the other hand, an idea such as that of the Church as a temple (chap. 16), so closely connected with

the ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, 61, 4 with ii. 7). The description of the woman, 1, 3, with its fulness of particulars (ἀγνή—στεργούσας τ. ἀνδρ.—οἰκουργεῖν—ὑποταγῆς—σωφρονούσας) touches very closely upon Titus ii. 4 f., and ἔτοιμον εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν, 2, 7, is from Titus iii. 1 (comp. also the εὐσεβῶς καὶ δικαίως, 62, 1, with Titus, ii. 12, and ἔργων ὧν κατεργασάμεθα ἐν, 32, 4, with Titus iii. 5). But he has also other favourite expressions, such as σεμνός, σώφρων, εὐσεβής with their derivatives, in common with the Pastoral Epistles, and has borrowed a number of their peculiarities, such as ἀναξωपुरεῖν, πιστωθεῖς, πρόσκλις, ἀγωγή, ἀνόσιος, βδέλυκτος and others.

the fundamental thoughts of the Epistle, must not be derived from the Corinthian letter. Where the Pastoral Epistles are concerned, the resemblance to Titus ii. 14 (14, 6: *λυτρωσάμενον ἡμᾶς—ἐτοιμάσαι ἑαυτῷ λαὸν ἄγιον*) is so striking, that by it the meaning of *ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθῆναι* (5, 6; 6, 7, 9; 12, 10; comp. 1 Tim. iii. 16) likewise becomes clear, although the Johanne echoes in themselves give a satisfactory explanation, (comp. § 5, 7); as also *καταργῆσαι τὸν θάνατον* (5, 6) is explained by 2 Tim. i. 10; *ἐπισωρεύσαντας ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις* (4, 6) by 2 Tim. iv. 3; iii. 6; and the farewell blessing *ὁ κύριος—μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος σου* (21, 9) by 2 Tim. iv. 22. The Epistle to the Ephesians is the only Pauline Epistle of which we find echoes in *Hermas*, e.g. Mand. x. 2, 2 ff., where the comment *λυπεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα* is taken from Eph. iv. 30; thus, *ἐν πνεύμα, ἐν σῶμα* (Sim. x. 13, 5) recalls Eph. iv. 4, because of the addition *μία πίστις* in 18, 4, and the *δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀλήθεια*, Sim. ix. 25, 2. On the other hand, he leans very much on the *Epistle of James*.¹ We are reminded of the Epistle to the Hebrews by the expressions *ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος*, Vis. ii. 3, 2 (Heb. iii. 12); the *κατηρτίσθη* of the creation of the world, Vis. ii. 4, 1 (Heb. xi. 3); and the *διδασκαὶ ξεναί*, Sim. viii. 6, 5 (Heb. xiii. 9). The echoes of the Petrine Epistles discovered by Zahn (of the First Epistle

¹ The detailed passage respecting the hearing of prayer (i. 6 ff.) evidently lies at the basis of Mand. ix. 1 ff.; Sim. v. 4, 3 f., and is frequently re-echoed (e.g. in Sim. iv. 6; comp. the *ἀνονειδίτως* in Sim. ix. 24, and the ever-recurring warning against *διψυχία*), just as the *δυνάμενος σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν* (i. 21) is echoed in Sim. vi. 1, 1; the *ἐπισκέπτεσθαι ὀφρανοῦς καὶ χήρας* (i. 27), in Sim. i. 8; Mand. viii. 10; the *τὸ ἔνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς* (ii. 7) in Sim. viii. 6, 4; the *ἀκατάστατον κακόν* (iii. 8) in Mand. ii. 3; the antithesis of *ἀνωθεν* and *ἐπίγειον* (iii. 15) in Mand. ix. 11; the *τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατέκτισεν ἐν ἡμῖν* (iv. 5) in Mand. iii. 1; the *ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν* (iv. 7) in Mand. xii. 2, 4; 4, 7; 5, 2); the prohibition of *καταλαλιά* (iv. 11) in Mand. ii. 2 f., and frequently elsewhere; the *ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι* (iv. 12) in Mand. xii. 6, 3; Sim. ix. 23, 4; the sighs against the rich of those who have been defrauded (v. 4; comp. v. 9) in Vis. iii. 9, 6; the *ἐρρυφήσατε καὶ ἐσπαταλήσατε* in Sim. vi. 1, 6; 2, .

by Holtzmann also, of the Second particularly by Dietlein in his Commentary) are very uncertain, although the phrase *πορεύονται ἀπάταις καὶ τρυφαῖς*, Sim. vi. 2, 2 (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 13), is certainly very striking. Neither do we find any palpable echo of the Apocalypse, notwithstanding much similarity of figure and symbol.

5. The epistle most freely used in the *Ignatian letters* is 1 Corinthians, viz. i. 18, 23; comp. ver. 20 with ad Eph. 18, 1; iv. 4 with ad Rom. 5, 1; vi. 9 with ad Eph. 16, 1, ad Philad. 3, 3; ix. 1 with ad Rom. 4, 3; ix. 27 with ad Trall. 12, 3; xv. 8 with ad Rom. 9, 2, to which may be added expressions such as *περίμψημα*, *οικοδομὴ θεοῦ*, *ἐδραῖος*, *ἀπελευθερος Ἰησ.* and others. On the other hand only *one* reference to the Roman epistle (i. 3 f.) occurs (ad Smyrn. 1, 1; comp. ad Eph. 18, 2), besides *one* to the Galatian Epistle (ad Smyrn. 9, 1: *ὡς ἔτι καιρὸν ἔχομεν*, comp. Gal. vi. 10); *one* to the Epistle to the Philippians (ad Philad. 8, 2: *μηδὲν κατ' ἐρίθειαν πράσσετε, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χριστομαθίαν*, comp. Phil. ii. 3, 5); *one* to the first Thessalonian Epistle (ad Eph. 10, 1: *ἀδιאלείπτως προσεύχεσθε*, comp. 1 Thess v. 17); and *one* to the second (ad Eph. 8, 1: *μὴ τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατάτω*, comp. 2 Thess. ii. 13). Further use is made of the Ephesian Epistle in the comparison of conjugal love with the love of Christ to the Church (ad Pol. 5, 1; comp. Eph. v. 25, 29), and in the description of the Christian armour (ad Pol. 6, 2; comp. Eph. vi. 13, 17); the *μιμηταὶ θεοῦ* (ad Eph. 1, 1; ad Trall. 1, 2) in particular are taken from Eph. v. 1. We are reminded of the Pastoral Epistles by a number of expressions, such as *ἀναζωπυρεῖν*, *ἀναψύχειν*, *αἰχμαλωτίζειν*, *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι*, *ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, *κατάστημα*, *μυθεύματα*, and the frequent designation of Christ as *ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν* (comp. 1 Tim. i. 1); but a certain application of any particular passage cannot be proved. In *Polycurp* the epistle most used is 1 Peter, in some respects with closer adhesion to the wording, viz. to i. 8 in 1, 13; to i. 13, 21 in 2, 1; to ii. 11 in 5, 3; to

ii. 12 in 10, 2; to ii. 24, 22 in 8, 1; to iii. 9 in 2, 2; to iv. 7 in 7, 2. On the other hand the only reference to the Philipian Epistle, notwithstanding the mention of it in 3, 2, is to be found in the *inimici crucis*, 12, 3 (comp. Phil. iii. 18). The only citation from the Roman Epistle (xiv. 10, 12) is 6, 2, perhaps mixed up in the memory with 2 Cor. v. 10. Whether 6, 1 does actually refer to 2 Cor. viii. 21, thus proving an acquaintance with the second Corinthian Epistle, seems doubtful, on account of Prov. iii. 4; but on the other hand it is certain that 11, 2 quotes from the passage 1 Cor. vi. 2, and that 5, 3 is a reminiscence of 1 Cor. vi. 9, as 5, 1 of Gal. vi. 7 (comp. also 3, 3 with Gal. iv. 26, and 9, 2 with ii. 2; 1, 3 of Eph. ii. 8 f. (comp. also 10, 2 with Eph. v. 21, and on 12, 1 comp. No. 1, note 2); 11, 4 of 2 Thess. iii. 15. Recollections of the Pastoral Epistles probably lie at the foundation of the exhortations to wives and deacons (chap. 4, 5), since the use of 1 Tim. vi. 10, 7 in 4, 1, and of 2 Tim. iv. 10 in 9, 2, is undoubted (comp. also 12, 3 with 1 Tim. ii. 2, and the polemic against the *ματαιολογία* 2, 1).

6. The use of the apostolic writings in the *Clementine Homily* is very scanty. But 2 Clem. 1, 8 is conditioned in its expression by Rom. iv. 17. The passage 1 Cor. ix. 24 f., certainly lies at the basis of 7, 1 f.; and 14, 2 even presupposes an acquaintance on the part of the readers with details such as Eph. v. 23 ff., 29 ff. (comp. also 19, 2: *ἔσκοτίσμεθα τὴν διάνοιαν* with Eph. iv. 18). With the Pastoral Epistles 2 Clement agrees only in such expressions as *ἐπιφάνεια, θεοσέβεια, κόσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι, διώκειν τὴν δικαιοσύνην* and *κοπιᾶν καὶ ἀγωνίζεσθαι*. The *πιστὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος*, 11, 6, is a reminiscence of Heb. x. 23. The *ἐφανέρωθη δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν*, 14, 2, recalls 1 Pet. i. 20; and the use of *καταλαλεῖν ἀλλήλων* as Christ's prohibition, 4, 3, is a reminiscence of James iv. 11 (comp. also the *ἐκδέχεσθαι καρπὸν* taken from James v. 7, and figuratively applied in 20, 3. The use of a single passage does not fully appear in

the Didache, unless the sign and wonder-working Antichrist has its origin in 2 Thess. ii. 9, or the ἄρπαξ, 2, 6, is added to the πλεονέκτης, in imitation of 1 Cor. v. 10. We only see how even isolated expressions in the New Testament ran more and more into ecclesiastical usage, as for example the μαρὰν ἀθά from 1 Cor. xvi. 22 (10, 6, comp. the ἐπιθυμητής from x. 6 in 3, 3); κακοήθης after Rom. i. 29 (2, 6); κεισόδος from Gal. v. 26 (3, 5), αἰσχρολόγος after Col. iii. 8 (3, 3), φιλάργυρος and ἀφιλάργυρος from 1 Tim. iii. 3; 2 Tim. iii. 2 (3, 5; 15, 1), ὀργίλος and αὐθάδης from Titus i. 7 (3, 2; 6); σαρκικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι from 1 Pet. ii. 11 (1, 4); or the ζυγὸν βαστάζειν from Acts xv. 10 (6, 2).

7. From this it appears that the Apostle Paul's most theological work, viz. the Epistle to the Romans, had by no means the greatest influence on the literature of the post-apostolic time. Clement, who shows a closer acquaintance with it than any other, has only copied from it a passage that has no theological importance whatever; while Barnabas, Ignatius, and Polycarp each contain but one reminiscence of it, the only one in the Clementine Homily not even being certain. The *first* *Corinthian Epistle* is much more freely used by Clement and Ignatius, and certainly by Polycarp as well as in the Clementine Homily, perhaps also in the Didache, while no trace of it is to be found in Barnabas. It would be natural to suppose that where the *first* *Corinthian Epistle* was known, the *second* also would be known, but with the exception of one doubtful passage in Polycarp, no trace of the latter appears. It seems in fact to have remained the private possession of those to whom it was addressed, until the time when the written memorials of the apostolic era were assiduously collected. The *Galatian Epistle* too is first met with in Ignatius and Polycarp. Much better known is the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, which perhaps had a wider currency owing to its original character of a circular letter, having from the first as such been frequently

copied; for we find indications of an acquaintance with it in Clement, Barnabas, and even in Hermas who seems ignorant of any other Pauline Epistle. It is undoubtedly made use of in Ignatius, Polycarp, and even in the Clementine Homily. On the other hand we find but slender trace in Barnabas of the Colossian Epistle which is so closely allied to it. That the short and purely personal Epistle to Philemon should nowhere be found cannot naturally be matter for surprise. The Philippian Epistle is without doubt already known to Clement, and is used by Ignatius and Polycarp. Echoes of both Thessalonian Epistles are to be found only in Ignatius; of the second we find traces in Polycarp also and perhaps even in the Didache. But the Pastoral Epistles manifestly belong to those that are best known. References to isolated passages are unmistakable in Clement, Barnabas, and Polycarp, in the first certainly to 1 Tim. and Titus, in the second to 2 Tim. and Tit., and in the third to the two Epistles to Timothy; but we find everywhere an echo of the peculiar terminology of these epistles, in Polycarp, in the Clementine Homily, and even in the Didache. Of the writings belonging to the primitive apostolic circle, Clement perhaps makes most use of the Epistle to the Hebrews, of which echoes are also to be found in Hermas and the Clementine Homily. Hermas also freely employs the *Epistle of James*, of which we elsewhere find an echo in the Clementine Homily alone; but 1 *Peter*, which was without doubt already known to Clement, is above all freely used in Polycarp. According to Eusebius 3, 39, it was likewise used by Papias; and we find an echo of it again in the Clementine Homily, perhaps also in the Didache. Traces of the *second* Epistle are very uncertain even in Hermas. We have already seen that an acquaintance with 1 John is abundantly manifest (§ 5, 7). That no trace is to be found of the two smaller Epistles or of Jude, cannot, however, appear strange. It is much more remarkable that no trace of acquaintance with the

Apocalypse is seen; while the gift of prophecy was still active in the Church, no preponderating weight can have been attached to this book. From what source Andreas and Arethas towards the end of the fifth century can have discovered that Papias looked upon it as an inspired and authentic production (comp. Rettig, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1831, 4), we do not know; but for his chiliasm he must have appealed to apostolic authority, if we may rely on Eusebius, who (*H. E.*, 3, 39) conjectures that he grossly misunderstood in a literal sense what was figuratively meant in the apostolic narratives. That Eusebius here refers to the Apocalypse of John, which he did not look upon as apostolic, is certainly very improbable; but from words of the Lord, such as that quoted by Papias, according to Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, v. 33, 3 f., he may at least have inferred an earthly kingdom of glory. On the other hand he certainly drew its thousand years of continuance from *Apoc.* xx. 1 f.

§ 7. THE GOSPEL CANON.

1. Even in *Justin the Martyr* the authority of the Lord exclusively was essentially on a par with that of the prophetic word (§ 5, 4, note 2). It is always by the words of the Lord, along with Old Testament Scripture, that he supports his utterances; but for the sake of proving his words, he attaches much greater importance than was formerly done to the details of the history of the life of Jesus, deriving both methods from the *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*.¹ This

¹ Thus, for the announcement by the angel of the miraculous conception and birth of the Virgin, he expressly appeals to *οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, Apol.* i. 33, and for the institution of the Last Supper, to the tradition of the Apostles, *ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια* (i. 66). In the Dialogue with Tryphon we read (chap. 88) that the Apostles of Christ had written that the Holy Ghost had descended on Him like a dove; and in chap. 100 the saying of the Lord, *καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ γέγραπται εἰπὼν* (*Matt.* xi. 27), is introduced, followed by the statement that it is written in the

very designation of the Gospels, reminding us of Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, shows that they are not regarded as sacred writings, like the prophetic books, but as primitive historical documents, whose credibility is established by their origin.² But it is by no means the literary situation in a work concerned with Jews and Gentiles that leads Justin to go back to this authentication of Scripture documents, but the fact that the generation which had heard the tradition of the life and words of Jesus from the mouth of the Apostles, had gradually died out. The clearest proof of this is that from him we first learn that the ἀπομνημονεύματα of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets were read at the Sunday assemblies (*Apol.* i. 67). This reading of evangelical writings in the public services was without doubt originally intended only to take the place of the oral evangelical tradition (the ζῶσα φωνή of Papias), that was gradually dying out or becoming uncertain, but which had always been a part of Divine worship.³ Even the Jew Tryphon

ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ that Christ is the Son of God. To these Apomnemoneumata Justin appeals twelve times before chap. 107, in different ways, for facts in the life of Christ, and four times for sayings of Christ (*Dial.* 103, 105, 107).

² So little are these writings placed on a par with those of the prophets, that Justin expressly says, he believes their authors, because the prophetic Spirit says the same things as they did (*Apol.* i. 33, comp. *Dial.* 53). For this very reason the γέγραπται with which in *Dial.* 49 an historical notice from Matt. xvii. 13 is introduced, cannot possibly be used in a technical sense, but only as the γεγρ. ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ., *Dial.* 100.

³ It now appears why in the Clementine Homily (2 Clem. 8, 5) a saying of the Lord is for the first time introduced with λέγει ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, and consequently a writing in which words of the Lord occur is designated as the Gospel; so also in the Didache (8, 2: ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ). Moreover, the fact that it calls upon its readers to do κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (11, 3), or ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (15, 4, comp. 15, 3), without citing particular passages, shows that the readers were acquainted and familiar with the contents of such a work (from the reading at worship). In the genitive of object we see plainly how the name first passed over from the oral preaching of Christ (de Christo) to writings where such preaching was formulated (comp. § 5, 6, note 2).

was perplexed about the *παραγγέλματα* of the Christians *ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ*, in reading the commands of the Lord contained therein (*Dial.* 10, 18). It was only as a consequence of the reading of evangelical writings at Divine service, that it first became usual to appeal expressly to them.

While it had formerly been taken for granted as a matter of course that the apostolic memorials to which Justin refers were our four Gospels, Stroth first thought he discovered in Justin's citations nothing more than fragments of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, while Eichhorn looked upon them as an elaboration of the primitive document, and Paulus as a harmony of the Gospels of Mark and Luke; but these hypotheses may be regarded as set aside by the exhaustive researches of Winer and Olshausen.⁴ The question was again raised by Credner, who in his *Beiträge zur Einleitung* (i., Halle, 1832) though admitting that Justin was acquainted with our four Gospels, yet represents him as having mainly used a Jewish Christian Gospel, that of Peter, which he thinks he has discovered in *Dial.* 106. But although he found favour with Mayerhoff and others, yet the refutations of Bindemann (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1842, 2) and Semisch (*die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrer Justin*, Hamb. und Gotha, 1848) may be regarded as having re-established the current view on a firmer footing. In any case de Wette, Reuss and Bleek only admit the use of the Hebrew or Petrine Gospel in conjunction with our four. The question was taken up for the third time by the Tübingen school, which, consistently with its fundamental view brought our four canonical Gospels as low down as possible, regarding them as the last deposit of an older Gospel literature, whose usage in the Churches had only been displaced by the Catholic Church in its development. Hence Schwegler, in his *nachapostol. Zeitalter* (1846), went beyond Credner, denying to Justin all knowledge of the canonical Gospels, and main-

⁴ Stroth's hypothesis in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, Bd. i., 1777, found great approbation among the leaders of rationalism, such as Semler, Weber, Rosenmüller, Wegscheider, because it harmonized with their tendency to point out the late formation of the Canon and the priority of heretical Gospels; while Eichhorn's view commended itself in connection with his hypothesis of a primitive document. The third has the greatest following. Comp. H. E. G. Paulus, "Ob das Evang. Just.'s das Evang. nach den Hebräern sei?" in his *exeget. krit. Abh.*, Tübingen, 1784. Grätz, *krit. Untersuchungen über Just.'s apostol. Denkw.*, Stuttgart, 1814. Against all three, comp. Winer, *Just. Mart. Evang. Canon. usum fuisse ostenditur*, Lips., 1819. Olshausen, *Rechttheit der vier kanonischen Evangelien*, Königsb., 1823.

taining that he used only the Petrine Gospel which is identical with the Hebrew one. But Hilgenfeld, who at first advocated a prevailing use of the Petrine Gospel which he regarded as transitional between Matthew and Luke and as the work on which our Mark is based (*krit. Untersuchungen über die Evang. Justin's, etc.*, Halle 1850, comp. on the other hand Ritschl in the *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851), though slow to admit the use of our four Gospels, was all the more decided in favour of this view; while Volkmar (*Ueber Justin und sein Verhältniss zu unseren Evang.*, Zürich, 1853, comp. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1855) could only fall back on the theory that the author of the fourth Gospel made use of Justin, and Scholten (*die ältesten Zeugnisse betr. die Schriften des N.T.*, Bremen, 1867) held fast to the older position of the school. Finally Credner, in his *Gesch. des Kanon*, represents the Petrine Gospel employed by Justin as a growth out of an older attempt to harmonize evangelical history according to the mind and spirit of Peter. Engelhardt (*das Christenthum Justins des Märtyrers*, Erlangen, 1878) makes Justin employ a harmony of our first three Gospels compiled for ecclesiastical use.

2. However natural it may be to assume that Justin made use of an extra-canonical, heretical, or apocryphal Gospel, we find no adequate reason for such assumption if we take into account the growing insignificance of the features which cannot be traced back to our Gospels, in proportion to the rich material which leads to their present form; ¹ it is very doubtful whether he made use even of the Acts of Pilate which he mentions in *Apol.* i. 35, 48, or was only acquainted with them, or perhaps had only heard of them. The idea that Justin made use of a single Gospel is abso-

¹ Features such as the birth of Jesus in the cave, the enumeration of His works as a carpenter and the fiery appearance at His baptism in the Jordan (*Dial.* 78, 83), are traditional explanations of the Gospel narrative which have passed over into various later Gospels, to some extent in a different form. But the assumption that the *πάρρα*, *Apol.* i. 33 (No. 1, note 1), excludes the use of oral tradition along with what had been written, rests on a straining of the letter that is quite at variance with the context. The tying of the ass to the vine (*Apol.* i. 32) is certainly a free Justinian colouring, just as the imputation of magic arts (*Dial.* 69) is his explanation of Matt. ix. 34. To supplement the voice of God at the baptism according to Ps. ii. 7 (*Dial.* 83, 103), was so natural that it required no Scriptural precedent, and the only unknown word of Christ (*Dial.* 48), if it does not proceed from oral tradition, is perhaps nothing but a condensation of Luke xvii. 34-37 (comp. the contraction of Matt. v. 22 in *Apol.* i. 16).

lutely excluded by the fact that he says of the ἀπομνημονεύματα, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια (*Apol.* i. 66) and ἃ φημι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντεράχθαι (*Dial.* 103), in spite of an occasional reference to the Gospel (*Dial.* 100; comp. 10). The freedom with which the words of the Lord are variously reproduced corresponds entirely to what we have observed in the older documents of the second century (§ 5, 5), with this exception only, that along with Justin's intentional going back to written Gospels, more comprehensive, verbal citations also occur. But the circumstance that what is taken from the Gospel narrative is reproduced quite freely and without dependence on the letter, only shows how far Justin is from holding the Gospel writings, as such, to be sacred. And for this very reason the natural mixing of traits or sayings of the Lord taken from different Gospels cannot point to the use of a harmony of the Gospels.² It is entirely consistent with the facts of the pre-

² It is not impossible to conceive that attempts should have been made even before Tatian, such as Harnack thought was exemplified in the words of the Lord quoted in the Didache (1, 3, 4, 5; 16, 1), which are put together or intermixed out of Matt. and Luke, constituting the use of Mark's Gospel enlarged out of Luke's (comp. No. 1, note 3, § 5, 6), since the ecclesiastical reading of written Gospels might in its beginning very easily lead to such procedure. But even where these mixed citations reappear in Justin himself or in other authors, they neither show the use of a Gospel harmony nor that of an uncanonical Gospel, since such mixings were already incorporated in oral tradition or were familiar to a writer, and might pass over from him to others. But this supposition is excluded by the fact that many of these apparent text-mixings, even where they recur, are more or less different, and that others are too unimportant or too much connected with extraneous matter to admit of being traced back to designed harmonizing. Comp. *e. gr.* the citation of Matt. iii. 16 (*Dial.* 49), which shows an alteration of the parallels that is quite unimportant, or a citation of Luke xii, 4 (*Apol.* i. 19) evincing a borrowing from Matthew alone, and the commingling of Luke xiii. 26 in Matt. vii. 22 (*Apol.* i. 16; *Dial.* 76). It is certain that an intermixing like that of Matt. xxiv. 5 with vii. 15 (*Dial.* 35) is the result of quotation from memory, as well as combinations such as that of Matt. iv. 10 with Mark xii. 30 (Luke x. 27) or of Luke xiii. 28 with Matt. xiii. 42 (*Apol.* i. 16).

Justinian time (§ 5, 6) that the great mass of Justin's citations always proceeds from the Gospel of Matthew. But it is our Greek Gospel with which Justin is acquainted and which he uses respecting the history of the wise men (*Dial.* 78), down to the invention of the stealing of the dead body (*Dial.* 108), since he makes Jesus Himself send the disciples for the ass with the colt (*Dial.* 53; comp. *Matt.* xxi. 2).³ But besides these allusions we find also a series of the Lord's words occurring only in Luke (*Dial.* 76, comp. *Luke* x. 19; *Apol.* i. 17, comp. *Luke* xii. 48; *Dial.* 105, comp. *Luke* xxiii. 46), or such words reproduced in a form specially characteristic of Luke (*Apol.* i. 15, 16, comp. *Luke* v. 32, vi. 27 f., xxix. 34; i. 19, comp. *Luke* xii. 4, xviii. 27; i. 66, comp. *Luke* xxii. 19; *Dial.* 81, comp. *Luke* xx. 36). Justin is familiar with the narrative parts of Luke's Gospel, from the history of the childhood, which he always interweaves with Matthew's account, down to the history of the passion, from which he quotes the sending of Jesus to Herod (*Dial.* 103, comp. *Luke* xxiii. 7 f.), and the history of the resurrection, from which he repeatedly quotes what the disciples had learnt from Scripture (*Apol.* i. 50, *Dial.* 106, comp. *Luke* xxiv. 25 ff., 44 ff.). He is even acquainted with the passage of the bloody sweat (*Luke* xxii. 44), from the Apomnemoneumata, of which he here (*Dial.* 103) takes occasion to say that they proceed not from the Apostles alone, but also ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων (*Luke* i. 3). It is plain that beside these two Gospels, that of Mark, which has so little that is peculiar, can scarcely come into consideration; but all doubt of acquaintance with it is excluded by the account of the naming of Zebedee's sons (*Mark* iii. 16 f.), which is expressly traced back to the Apomnemo-

³ Comp. also the citations from this Gospel deviating from the fundamental text as well as from the LXX., which are occasionally introduced with the same formula as in Matthew; the many sayings of the Lord known only to the first Gospel, or forms of such sayings peculiar to it alone, even to the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν and the πατήρ ὁ οὐράνιος.

neumata of Peter (*Dial.* 106), i.e. to the Gospel of Mark.⁴ It is therefore beyond all doubt that Justin knew and employed our three Gospels.

3. Since the researches of Thoma respecting Justin's literary relation to John's Gospel (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1875, 3, 4), the opinion that Justin was not yet acquainted with the fourth Gospel, once so obstinately adhered to by the Tübingen school, must be regarded as definitely set aside. Unquestionably his whole doctrine of the Logos has its origin in John's Gospel;¹ from this narrative he takes the words of the Baptist whom he too calls simply John (*Dial.* 88, comp. John i. 20, 23), the account that Jesus healed the man who was afflicted *ἐκ γενεῆς* (*Apol.* i. 22; *Dial.* 69; comp. John ix. 1), and that He was reviled as a *λαόπλανος* (*Dial.* 69, comp. *Gosp.* vii. 12).² It is true he quotes only one saying

⁴ This Gospel too certainly belongs to those that were composed by the *παρακολουθήσαντες* of the Apostles (*Dial.* 103: *συντεράχθαι*); but Justin plainly knows that it stands in close relation to a single Apostle, and that it does in fact contain the *ἀπομνημονεύματα* of Peter, even though set down in writing by an apostolic disciple. All critical twistings of the text of this passage are therefore useless, while it is impossible and at variance with the whole usage of Justin that *αὐτοῦ* should refer to Christ; but all attempts to find here a particular heretical Petrine Gospel (No. 1) are frustrated by the fact that here and here alone reference is made to a notice occurring only in Mark. Moreover the assertion that Jesus was a *τέκτων νομιζόμενος* (*Dial.* 88) rests on Mark vi. 3, and the repeated statement as to the place where the disciples found the foal tied (*Apol.* i. 32; *Dial.* 53) are based on Mark xi. 4.

¹ Justin treats of the *μονογενῆς* (*Dial.* 105), who was with the Father before all created beings, and by whom everything was created (*Apol.* ii. 6), the *σαρκοποιηθεὶς* (*Apol.* i. 32, 66) who gives living-water to the heart (*Dial.* 114, comp. 69), of the *γεννημένος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπελου σπέρματος ἀλλ' ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ* (*Dial.* 63; comp. John i. 13). He says, that through Him *τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπιγνώμια πάντα* is given to us (*Dial.* 121), that through Him we *ἐπὶ τὸν πατέρα προσχωροῦμεν* (*Dial.* 17) and now *προσκυνοῦμεν λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* (*Apol.* i. 6).

² Comp. *Apol.* i. 63, according to which he convinced the Jews *ὡς οὖτε τὸν πατέρα οὖτε τὸν υἱὸν ἐγνωσαν* (John viii. 19), *Dial.* 106, according to which he knew *τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ πάντα παρέχειν αὐτῷ* (John xiii. 3), and the reference to circumcision taking place on the Sabbath (*Dial.* 12;

of the Lord from this Gospel, which is altered by virtue of its context and is mixed up with a phrase from Matthew (*Apol.* i. 61); nevertheless the allusion to the misunderstanding of Nicodemus, by which it is followed, shows beyond doubt that John iii. 3 f., was in the mind of the Apologist. But when Justin tries to uphold the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ against opponents, because he must follow τοῖς δι' αὐτοῦ διδασθεῖσι appealing to the Apomnemoneumata (*Dial.* 48, 105) in favour of the incarnation of the μονογενῆς τῷ πατρὶ and of the ἐξ αὐτοῦ λόγος, he must have counted John's Gospel among these books, especially as *Dial.* 103 points out that more than one of them proceeded directly from Apostles. But it is a remarkable fact that in speaking of Christ's higher essence, he never quotes His utterances respecting Himself contained in John, but only refers to Matt. xi. 27 (*Dial.* 130); and that much freer use is made throughout of the first and third Gospels than of the fourth. Yet this only leads to the conclusion that Justin still belonged to the time when the use of the older Gospels, especially that of Matthew, was far more extended than that of John, a time whose knowledge of the sayings and history of the Lord had been formed essentially on the basis of common tradition proceeding from them (comp. § 5, 7). Whatever was drawn from his closer employment of Luke's Gospel, could amalgamate more readily with these than what he read in John's Gospel. This procedure might promote and determine the development of his theological views, but it could not enlarge the circle of the Lord's words with which he was familiar. That he consciously distinguished between the older Gospels as historical documents and the fourth as a doctrinal work, comp. John vii. 22 f.). Comp. also the form of the citation from Zechariah xii. 10 with John xix. 37 (*Apol.* i. 52). Even the θεοῦ τέκνα ἀληθινὰ καλούμεθα καὶ ἐσμὲν (*Dial.* 123) reminds us of 1 John iii. 1; and the statement that Christ became man ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῶν δαιμονίων (*Apol.* ii. 6) is a reminiscence of 1 John iii. 8.

must be decidedly rejected; but the fact that the image of the historical life and teaching of Christ, mirrored in the Church, was formed from the older Gospels, is still decisive for his use of the Apomnemoneumata.

4. In proportion as Justin goes back to the written memoirs of the Apostles for the words and history of the Lord, does his appeal to the oral preaching of the Apostles become prominent. He continually relates how these latter had fallen away and become scattered in consequence of Christ's death on the cross, until the risen Saviour appeared to them and convinced them that His sufferings were foretold in the Scriptures (*Apol.* i. 67; *Dial.* 53, 76, 106); and he tells how, armed with Divine *δύναμις* proceeding from Him (*Apol.* i. 50; *Dial.* 42), they went out from Jerusalem into all the world as His ambassadors (*Apol.* i. 35, 45, 49), to preach the crucified and exalted Christ as the fulfilment of all prophecy.¹ But with their preaching of Christ was associated the preaching of His doctrine (*Apol.* i. 40, 42) or the word of God (*Apol.* i. 39, *Dial.* 109), i.e. of the new Divine law given by Him, for which reason faith in their teaching was always followed by a change of mind and life, the new circumcision of the heart (*Apol.* i. 53; *Dial.* 114). This by no means refers simply to a repetition of His words from memory, since the Divine power of Christ with which they were endowed, empowered them to regulate anew the life of the Gentiles, the more minute details respecting the rite of

¹ In the fact that they are repeatedly designated as the Twelve (*Apol.* i. 39; *Dial.* 42) Hilgenfeld, with the whole Tübingen school, incorrectly finds an antithesis to the Apostle Paul, since it is obviously important in Justin's view to authenticate the origin of the apostolic preaching in its immediate connection with the history of Jesus. These descriptions plainly proceed from the Acts of the Apostles, which is also used as a primitive document (comp. *Apol.* i. 50 with Acts i. 8, ii. 3), a knowledge of which is already attested by the application of Psalm ii. to Herod and Pilate (*Apol.* i. 40, comp. Acts iv. 24) and many other echoes (comp. *Apol.* i. 49 with Acts xiii. 27, 48; *Dial.* 16 with Acts vii. 52; *Dial.* 36, 76 with Acts xxvi. 22, f.).

baptism being also traced back to their teaching (*Apol.* i. 61). Their word which teaches the true *θεοσέβεια* to the Gentiles, may now be put directly on a par with the *νόμος* (*Dial.* 100). It is the same *φωνή τοῦ θεοῦ*, which speaks through them as formerly through the prophets, and leads to the renunciation of everything worldly (*Dial.* 119). But the Church still knows itself to be in full possession of this living, oral preaching of the Apostles (comp. § 6, 2). There is the less occasion to go back to the early written record of it, since an appeal to the Old Testament and to the complete agreement between it and the *Apomnemeumata* now largely plundered for their historical contents (comp. No. 1), really suffices for the refutation of the errors that had cropped up in the Church itself. The only apostolic writing besides these, mentioned in Justin, is the Apocalypse of the Apostle John, but it does not come into consideration on account of the apostolic teaching contained in it, but on account of its prophecy of the thousand years' reign (*Dial.* 81).² There cannot therefore be any question as yet of a collection of apostolic Epistles or of their canonicity or equality with the O. T. Scriptures, or even with the Gospels.

It is certain, notwithstanding, that Justin is also acquainted with Pauline Epistles and is influenced by them. It is characteristic throughout that what he has chiefly adopted from the Epistle to the Romans is the application of the Old Testament in the Christian sense, as appears from the many citations common to both in their form, connection and application (comp. Rom. iii. 11-17 and *Dial.* 27; ix. 27 ff., and *Dial.*

² Only because the chief of the demons is here termed *ὄφης, σατᾶν, διάβολος* (Apoc. xx. 1 f. 10), does Justin appeal to *τὰ ἡμέτερα συγγράμματα* (*Apol.* i. 28); and the free use of the citation from Zech. xii. 10 in *Dial.* 14 has a manifest ring of Apoc. i. 7, etc. Justin's passage respecting the Apocalypse of John has by Rettig (*über das erweislich älteste Zeugn. f. d. Echth. d. Apok.*, Leipz., 1829) been declared not to be genuine, on quite untenable grounds. Respecting Justin's relation to Paul, comp. Otto, in the *Zeitsch. für hist. Theol.*, 1842, 2; 1843, 1; Thoma in the *Zeitsch. für wiss. Theol.*, 1875, 3, 4; respecting his relation to the Acts of the Apostles, Overbeck, *ibid.*, 1872, 3.

55; x. 16 and *Dial.* 42; xi. 2 ff., and *Dial.* 39. 46; xiv. 11 and *Apol.* i. 52), and the repeated statements respecting the justification of Abraham as the father of believing Gentiles, taken from Rom. iv. (*Dial.* 11; 23; 119). The only allusion of a different character occurs in *Apol.* i. 14, δύναμις θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, which recalls Rom. i. 16, the ἐν συνειδήσεσιν ἐχθραῖς ταῦτα οὐκ εἰδόντας ἀλλήλοις ἀπερ ἐργάζονται, *Dial.* 93, which recalls Rom. ii. 15 (comp. also the recurring ἀσέβεια καὶ ἀδικία and ἀναπολόγητος from Rom. ii. 18, 20). From the first Epistle to the Corinthians are taken the O. T. type of the passover lamb (*Dial.* 111: ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ὁ Χριστός, ὁ τυθείς and *Dial.* 14: τὰ παλαιὰ τῆς κακῆς ζυμῆς ἔργα, comp. 1 Cor. v. 7, 8), the image of the body and its many members (*Dial.* 42, comp. 1 Cor. xii.). The image of the seed-corn for the resurrection with the ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνδύσασθαι (*Apol.* i. 19, comp. 1 Cor. xv.), the ἀνάμνησις τοῦ πάθους, Christ παρέδωκεν (*Dial.* 41, 70, comp. 1 Cor. xi.), and the σχίσματα καὶ αἰρέσεις (*Dial.* 35, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 18 f.). Comp. also the antithesis of the σοφία ἀνθρώπεια and the δύναμις θεοῦ, 1 Cor. ii. 5 and *Apol.* i. 60. On the other hand we find no trace even here of the second Corinthian Epistle, since the ψευδαπόστολοι, *Dial.* 35, cannot in itself be regarded as such. Again, the citations in *Dial.* 95, 96 of the curse of the law and of him who hangeth upon a tree specially reminds us, by their form and application to the work of redemption, of the *Galatian Epistle* (iii. 10, 13). The same thing applies to the citation of the *Ephesian Epistle* (iv. 8, comp. *Dial.* 39; 87), and to the application of the type of circumcision in the *Colossian Epistle* (ii. 11, f., comp. *Dial.* 41; 43), of which we are also reminded by πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως and his πρὸ πάντων εἶναι (i. 16 f., comp. *Dial.* 85; 138; 96). The second Epistle to the Thessalonians is recalled by the ἀνθρώπος τῆς ἀνομίας and τῆς ἀποστασίας (*Dial.* 32; 110, comp. 2 Thess. ii. 3, 7) and the δίκας τίνειν διὰ πυρὸς αἰώνιον (*Apol.* i. 17, comp. 2 Thess. i. 8 f.), while the only reminiscence of the Epistle to the Philippians (ii. 7, etc., comp. *Dial.* 134: ἐδούλευσε καὶ τὴν μέχρι σταυροῦ δουλείαν ὁ Χριστός) is very uncertain. We are reminded of the *Pastoral Epistles* by the frequent expression ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ Χριστοῦ, as well as τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα καὶ δαιμόνια (*Dial.* 7, comp. 1 Tim. iv. 1) and ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Dial.* 34, comp. Tit. iii. 4). In imitation of the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ is frequently called ἀπόστολος (iii. 1), perhaps also πρωτότοκος and ἀγγελος (i. 6, 9), most probably ὁ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελλισ. βασιλεὺς Σαλῆμ καὶ αἰώνιος ἱερεὺς ὑψίστου (vii. 1 ff., comp. *Dial.* 113) and the ἀρχιερεὺς (comp. also *Dial.* 13 with Heb. ix. 13 f.). The parallel between the ψευδοπροφῆται and ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι in *Dial.* 82 is a notable reminiscence of 2 Pet. ii. 1, and the destruction of the world by fire in contrast with the deluge in *Apol.* ii. 7, of 2 Pet. iii. 6 ff., without our being able to draw from them a certain conclusion as to a knowledge of the Epistles. This use of apostolic Epistles fully corresponds to that of the Johannine writings (No. 3).

5. Justin has therefore no knowledge of a Canon of apostolic writings, nor even of a Canon of the Gospels; for if it were actually probable that he employed only our four Gospels, he uses them as historical documents and not as sacred writings. Nevertheless, the reading of the evangelical books at public worship, first attested by him, would very soon lead as a matter of course to their being looked upon as equal to the sacred books of the Old Testament. Thus already in Tatian, Justin's pupil, a phrase of the Johannine prologue (Gospel i. 5) is introduced quite like a citation from the Old Testament (*Orat. ad Gr.*, 13: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον). At first indeed it is always the Lord speaking in them which properly constitutes their canonical authority, as we have already seen in Hegesippus (§ 5, 4). The words of the Lord are the λόγοι οἷς ἐντρεφόμεθα (*Athenag. leg.* 11), while the Epistle to the Churches at Lyons and Vienne (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 5, 2) quotes a saying of the Lord quite in the old manner (ἐπληροῦτο τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν εἰρημένον; John xvi. 2). But as a matter of fact it is exclusively the Gospels from which these are taken, and which, because they contain such sayings of the Lord, are placed on a par with the O. T. writings, as κυριακαὶ γραφαί; which appears from the words of Dionysius of Corinth (circ. 170) preserved in Euseb., *H. E.*, 4, 23. After Justin's time the fourth Gospel was more and more definitely placed on an equality with the three older ones.¹ Even Tatian, in whose discourse to the Greeks no distinct reference to a synoptic passage

¹ Of Hegesippus, who in the legend respecting James makes use of the saying of Luke xxiii. 34 (Euseb., *H. E.*, 2, 23), Eusebius tells also that he ἐκ τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγελίου (καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊδος διαλέκτου) τινὰ τίθησιν καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὡς ἐξ Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀγράφου παραδόσεως μνημονεύει (*H. E.*, 4, 23). But it does not by any means follow that he looked on the Gospel to the Hebrews as the specific or even as an essential source of the authoritative word of the Lord; nor do we know that any Gospels besides our own were read anywhere throughout the Church.

occurs, has many echoes of it besides the citation already mentioned (*Orat.* 4, comp. *Gosp.* i. 1; 13, comp. i. 5; 19, comp. *Gosp.* i. 3); and Athenagoras obviously draws his doctrine of the Logos from John.² The historical part of it also is already regarded as having equal weight with the presentation of the history of Jesus contained in the older Gospels. Melito of Sardis in a Fragment (comp. Otto, *Corp. Apol.*, ix. p. 416) estimates the public ministry of Christ as lasting a *τριετία*, which is only possible on the basis of John's Gospel, while according to Luke iii. 23, He was thirty years of age before His baptism. Polycrates of Ephesus (*apud Euseb.*, 5, 24), following the Gospel xiii. 25, describes John as *ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσών*, and Apollinaris of Hierapolis in a fragment in the Paschal Chronicle (ed. Dindorf, p. 14) not only makes an undoubted allusion to the Gospel xix. 34, but rejects the right conception of the day of Christ's death in the Synoptics, on account of the divergent representation in John, and in so far *στασιάζειν δοκεῖ τὰ εὐαγγέλια*. Hence the Gospels already form in his estimation a united sacred whole in which there can be no question of a contradiction.

6. From the fact that Christian authors or other prominent Churchmen know and use our four Gospels, it does not

² Comp. the allusion to John i. 3 (*Leg.* 4, 10), and in the latter passage the abiding of the Son in the Father and of the Father in the Son (comp. also the *κοινωνία τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν υἱόν*, *Leg.* 12, with 1 John i. 3). In Athenagoras besides the *φησὶ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα* (*Leg.* 18) we find also a saying of the Lord quoted from Matthew v. 28, Mark x. 11, Luke xviii. 27, and introduced simply with *φησὶ* (*Leg.* 32, 33; *de Resurr.* 9), as well as a free application of sayings which are given in a mixed form from Matthew and Luke (*Leg.* i. 11, 12). Whether the saying in *Leg.* 32, referring to a late Church-custom, and introduced in a way that is quite peculiar, as a speech of the Logos, is an historical word of the Lord, may fairly be doubted. In the Church letter in Euseb., *H. E.*, 5, 2, besides the express citation from John xvi. 2, with the exception of a reminiscence of Luke i. 5, we find only echoes of John's Gospel (comp. the *πηγὴ ὕδατος ζῶντος*, the *παράκλητος* and *υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*, the *ψυχὴν θεῖναι ὑπὲρ τ. ἀδελφῶν*).

of course follow that all four existed and were read in all the Churches. It is more likely that, in many cases, the Churches were in possession only of *one* Gospel, as appears from formulæ such as *ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* (Did. 15, 3, 4, comp. No. 1, note 3); and it is certain that many of the text-mixings that have become stereotyped originated in the circumstance that those who knew the words of the Lord as recorded in other Gospels, altered and supplemented the Gospel in use among themselves to make it accord with these. It was only when it became more and more universally known that there were four Gospels, and only four, which were read here and there among the Churches and thus accredited, that the thought of forming them into a Gospel-harmony for ecclesiastical use could arise, since Mark has too little that is peculiar to him alone, and John presents too many difficulties in the way of such an attempt to make it probable that these very four had been selected for the purpose from a multitude of others. That Tatian had compiled a Gospel-harmony of this kind (*συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθείς*) and had called it *τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων*, is narrated by Eusebius (*H. E.*, 4, 29), at whose time it was in occasional use, although he himself seems not to have been acquainted with it, any more than Epiphanius, who mentions it in *Hær.*, 46, 1. Again (about 450) Theodoret of Cyrus found more than 200 copies of it in his diocese, and because he thought many of its omissions were mutilations in the interest of heresy, he removed it in order to replace it by the four Gospels in their entirety (*Hær. fab.*, 1, 20).

The views elaborated in connection with the hypotheses concerning Justin's Gospel (No. 1), viz. that the so-called Diatessaron was the Gospel of Peter or a form of the Gospel to the Hebrews, had always a strong argument against them in the testimony of Dionysius Bar Salibi in the 12th century, who states that the Diatessaron of Tatian, commented upon by Ephraem the Syrian, began with the introductory words of John's Gospel (comp. Daniel, *Tatian, der Apologet.*, Halle, 1837;

Semisch, *Tat. Diatessaron.*, Vratisl., 1856), but have been definitely set aside by an Armenian translation of that Commentary, which was turned into Latin by A. Aucher and improved by G. Moesinger, furnished with annotations, and published at Venice, 1876. Comp. respecting it, A. Harnack, in the *Zeitschrift f. Kirchengesch.*, 1891, 4 Th.; Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, Erlangen, 1881. Accordingly no doubt remains that Tatian elaborated our four Gospels into one whole, and Zahn has pointed out from Aphraates and the doctrine of Addai how his Gospel-harmony was an authority as *the* Gospel in the Syrian Church for a long time. In it the text of the Gospels is very freely handled and much abridged, which could only have been done before the evangelical books as such had the reputation in the Churches of being sacred. Even omissions, of the genealogies for example, were perhaps originally quite accidental, and were due simply to the fact that they did not seem to be adapted for public reading in the Churches. The fact that it even adopts such incidents as the appearance of the light at the Jordan (comp. Zahn, p. 241), is only another proof how little reason we have to assume that Justin took it entirely from one Gospel (comp. No. 2, note 1). Zahn has tried to explain the strange account of Epiphanius (*ibid.*), according to which some call the Diatessaron καθ' Ἑβραίων, by supposing that the Diatessaron was composed in Syriac; but it is just as easy to explain it on the assumption that the error arose from what was known as a Syrian translation of it.

The oldest Syrian and Latin translations of the four Gospels (comp. Cureton, *Remains of a very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac*, London, 1858; Fr. Baethgen, *der Griech. Text des Cureton. Syrers*, Leipzig, 1885; L. Ziegler, *die lat. Bibelübers. vor Hieronymus*, München, 1879), which made them accessible to the Syriac and Latin-speaking Churches, must have proceeded from the time when these Gospels were generally used for public reading in the Churches. Such translations show that the separate Churches had gradually adopted the same usage, and each one was anxious to possess all four Gospels. That these were employed even in Jewish-Christian circles, is established by the pseudo-Clementine Homilies since the discovery of their conclusion in 1853 (comp. 19, 22 with John ix. 2, etc.). Even by the heathen the written Gospels alone were regarded as the *συγγράμματα* of the Christians. From

Origen's work against Celsus, we see that he tries to refute the Christians from these as the documents recognised by themselves (2, 74), and that by them he understands in reality our four Gospels.¹ Thus a fixed Canon of the Gospels based on the exclusive ecclesiastical validity of our four Gospels gradually arose. The time when it became universally established can of course no longer be definitely ascertained; but so early as the end of the second century, Bishop Serapion would no longer permit the use of Peter's Gospel (comp. § 8, 4) in the Churches of Rhossus in Cilicia (Euseb., *H.E.*, 6, 12). It is certain that Irenæus, when near his eightieth year he wrote his great work against the heretics, already regarded it as an established fact that the Logos had given us τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐνὶ δὲ πνεύματι συνεχόμενον, and already seeks to prove an arrangement of Providence, from the significance of the number four (*Adv. Hær.*, iii. 11, 8). It is equally certain that with Tertullian, the *autoritas ecclesiarum apostolicarum* stands side by side with our four Gospels (*Adv. Marc.*, 4, 5), and Clement of Alexandria speaks of the four Gospels as τὰ παραδεδομένα ἡμῖν (*Strom.* 3, 13).² But when in his Hypotyposen he gives a παράδοσις

¹ When he upbraids them with having altered τὸ εὐαγγέλιον three and four times and even oftener (2, 27), this was plainly the impression he derived from the mixing of like and unlike in the Gospels; but besides our Gospels he seems to have been acquainted also with heretical remodellings. From his polemic it appears that he chiefly used Matthew, though also Luke and John, and from his pointing to the fact that some speak of two angels in the history of the resurrection (Luke, John) and some only one (Matt., Mark), we see that he was acquainted with our four Gospels as the συγγράμματα of the Christians (5, 52, 56).

² When Clement sometimes quotes words of Christ which are not found in the Gospels, they proceed probably from oral tradition, *e. gr.* the free alteration of Matt. vi. 33 (*Strom.* 1, 24), even where they are quoted as γραφή (1, 28) or refer back to a Gospel (5, 10), which simply rests on a misconception, as is undoubtedly the case with respect to the saying ascribed to Christ in 3, 15 (comp. § 5, 6, note 1). It cannot be proved that Clement acknowledged the Gospel according to the Hebrews from the citation out of it along with Plato's *Theatetus* and the παραδόσεις of Matthew (2, 9).

τῶν ἀνάκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων respecting the order in which the Gospels were written (apud Euseb., *H.E.*, 6, 14), it is clear that among those πρεσβύτεροι the four Gospels alone were regarded as ecclesiastically valid.³ The first foundation of a New Testament Canon was thus laid. It will be seen, especially in Tertullian, how at the end of the second century the Church already felt itself bound by ecclesiastical usage respecting the Gospels. Hence we may the more readily assume that two decades at least had already passed away since this usage had arisen and been more or less firmly settled.

7. The more clearly we perceive the relations under which in the third quarter of the second century the collection of the four Gospels attained to ecclesiastical authority, the less can we suppose that a collection of New Testament Epistles, of equal value in the eyes of the Church, was already in existence at that time. Melito of Sardis procures and imparts accurate information regarding the number and order of the books of the Old Covenant (Euseb., *H.E.*, 4, 26), but we hear nothing of a similar undertaking with respect to the New Testament writings, although he must have already been acquainted with books that come under this category (comp. § 9, 1). Ewald's hypothesis of a collection of Pauline Epistles and a hundred other works, which were read on Sundays, is pure imagination. Though Eusebius concludes from a letter of Dionysius of Corinth, that the so-called first Epistle of Clement ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους was read in

³ It is certain that Theophilus of Antioch, to judge from his work *ad Autol.*, is also acquainted with the Gospels of Matthew (3, 13), of Luke (2, 13) and of John (2, 22). Jerome, according to the *Viris Ill.*, 25, read a commentary on the Gospel, having his name, the genuineness of which he appears indeed to doubt in that work, but which he mentions afterwards without any such suspicion (comp. *pref. in Matt.*). This commentary, according to the *epist.* 121 *ad Algas.* worked up the words of the four evangelists in some harmonistic way (comp. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Gesch. des NTlichen Kanon*, 2, Erlangen, 1883).

his church (*H. E.*, 4, 23), yet the passage he quotes in support of his view only states that an epistle which they had received from the Romans was read by them on the Sunday, *i.e.* at the regular meeting of the Church, and would always continue to be read for their admonition, as would also be the case with the epistle written by Clement. The question therefore turns upon an occasional reading of such Church-letters, which can by no means be put in comparison with a public reading of the holy Scriptures at worship. The case was somewhat different with the Apocalypse, which as a work of the prophetic spirit was brought forward as a means of proof even before Justin (No. 4).¹ But when we read in Athenagoras *δεῖ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο — ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν* (*De Resurr.*, 18), we must consider that we have here to do, not with the instruction or admonition of an apostle as such, but with a passage where Paul, speaking in the prophetic spirit, says *ἰδοὺ μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω* (1 Cor. xv. 51, 53). Besides, no citations of New Testament epistles are to be found in writings certainly belonging to this time,² but only more or less distinct echoes of such as attest the literary value of detached words or expressions taken from them, as in Justin (No. 4).

¹ According to Eusebius (*H. E.*, 4, 26), Melito of Sardis also wrote upon it. Athenagoras (*Leg.* 36) has it in his mind in the words *ἀποδώσειν τὴν γῆν τοῖς ἰδίους νεκροῖς* (Apoc. xx. 13) and in the Epistle of the Church at Lyons and Vienne, which in any case showed an acquaintance with the Apocalypse, since it has an undoubted reference to xiv. 4 (comp. also the *πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς μάρτυς* and the *πρωτόκοκτος τῶν νεκρῶν*, Apoc. iii. 14; i. 5, apud Euseb., *H. E.*, 5, 3), a passage is cited out of it (xxii. 11) with *ἴνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῆ* (Euseb., *H. E.*, 5, 2), if there be not here an interchange with Daniel xii. 10.

² Assuredly the *Ep. ad. Diogn.* does not belong to these in its concluding part, where (chap. 11) we read *εἶτα φόβος νόμου ἔσται καὶ προφητῶν χάρις γνωσκειται, καὶ εὐαγγελίων πῖστις ἴδρῆται καὶ ἀποστόλων παράδοσις φυλάσσειται, καὶ ἐκκλησίας χάρις σκιρτᾷ*, and chap. 12 is adduced with *ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει* 1 Cor. viii. 1.

Thus we have an echo of the *Epistle to the Romans* in Tatian (*Orat.* 4 : τούτον διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως αὐτοῦ ἴσμεν καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὸ ἄρατον τοῖς ποιήμασι καταλαμβάνεμεθα, comp. Rom. i. 20; *orat.* 11 : δούλοι γεγόναμεν οἱ ἐλεύθεροι, διὰ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐπράθημεν, comp. Rom. vii. 15); in Athenagoras we find the λογικὴ λατρεία from Rom. xii. 1 (*Leg.* 13), and a plain imitation of Rom. i. 27 (*Leg.* 34); in the Church epistle contained in Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 2, we have the ζῆλον τῷ πνεύματι taken from Rom. xii. 11, and the verbal use of Rom. viii. 18; while the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (chap. 10) has a reference to Rom. xiii. 1, 7). Only faint echoes of the *first Epistle to the Corinthians* are to be found in the Greek Discourse and the *Martyrdom* (comp. the image of the *υἱὸς* and the *ψυχικοὶ* in *Orat.* 15 and *Mart. Pol.*, 1, with 1 Cor. x. 33, xi. 1), and in Athenagoras, *de Resurr.*, besides the above citation, we have the doctrine of the change of those that are alive and remain (chap. xii. xvi.) and the peculiar expression δουλαγωγεῖν (chap. xix.). Finally we have a trace also of the *second Epistle to the Corinthians* (iii. 14, etc.) in the θριαμβεύειν and the εὐωδία Χριστοῦ (apud Euseb., v. 2, 29, 35), and a manifest reference to v. 10 in Athen., *de Resurr.*, 18. The latter is acquainted also with the πτωχὰ καὶ ἀσθενῆ στοιχεῖα from Gal. iv. 4 (*Leg.* 16). Of the minor Pauline Epistles we have an undoubted reference to *Phil.* ii. 6 in the Church-letter, as well as a reminiscence of the ἀντικείμενος of the *second Epistle to the Thessalonians* and His second coming (Euseb., 5, 2, 3). Of the *Pastoral Epistles*, the First to Timothy is well known to Athenagoras (comp. ii. 2, ii. 1, with chap. 13, 37, and the φῶς ἀπρόσιτον, chap. 16), and in the Church-letter in Euseb. 5, 2, occurs the στυλὸς καὶ ἐδράκιον from 1 Tim. iii. 15. Of Tatian we hear incidentally (§ 8, 5, note 2) that he acknowledged the *Epistle to Titus*, although it cannot be shown that it was used. On the other hand we find no certain trace of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, even in the ἀπαύγασμα of Tatian (*Orat.* 16) or the ἀγγελοὶ λειτουργοὶ (Athen., *Leg.* 10); nor of the *Petrine Epistles* in the expressions ἀσωτία (*Orat.* 17), or σκῆνωμα (*Orat.* 15). But certainly there is a clear reference to 1 *Pet.* v. 6, in the Church-letter (Euseb. 5, 3, comp. also the τιμὴν ἀπονέμειν Athenag., *Leg.* 32) which also shows familiarity with the *Acts of the Apostles* (comp. the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς, and the mention of Stephen's prayer, ap. Euseb., 5, 3) from which we have in Tatian only some singular expressions (σπερμολόγος, θεομάχοι, *Orat.* 6, 13).

The fact that there is no reference to the apostles as an authority for doctrine, may have its origin in the circumstance that the documents here considered treat nowhere of an antithesis within Christianity, as is perhaps the case in Polycarp (§ 6, 2); but the circumstance that apart from casual prophetic words, the necessity of direct reference to

the writings of the apostles never arises, shows clearly that until after the third quarter of the second century, the conditions for the formation of an *epistolary* Canon are utterly wanting. So much the more striking must it appear when the Tübingen school declares it to be a literary form adapted to the spirit of the time and without ulterior motive, that in the first half of the second century numerous works should have been put into circulation under apostolic names (comp. Koestlin, *Die pseudonyme Literatur der ältesten Kirche; Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, 2), while it is not evident what object this form could have had at a time when no need of a written authentication of apostolic doctrine was felt, and the name of an apostle at the head of a writing by no means gave it unique authority. On the other hand, these pretended primitive documents of the second century show no trace of the very thing which is characteristic of the real primitive documents belonging to it, viz. an appeal to the words of the Lord and the written Gospels. Yet it is strange enough that the most important productions of this time, at least in a spiritual sense, and most profound in their theology, should all have decked themselves out in borrowed apostolic names, while only the comparatively weaker and less important ventured to appear under their own name or that of a contemporary. It is plain that only the same relations of time can have given rise to the need of going back to the apostolic writings on the one hand and to a pseudonymous apostolic literature on the other.

§ 8. THE CANON OF APOSTOLIC TRADITIONAL DOCTRINE.

1. In the course of the second century Gnosticism was developing into a sect, while Ebionism had already become such. Against these heretical tendencies, neither the sacred scripture of the Old Testament, whose authority was even disputed on many occasions, and which by means of alle-

gorical interpretation was explained in the most diverse ways in the Church itself, nor the simple words of the Lord could suffice. Even the Gospel-Canon that was gradually taking shape, proved of doubtful value, since as a new sacred scripture it gave unlimited scope for allegorical interpretation. Hence there naturally followed a return to the teaching of the apostles, who with the simple announcement of the saving facts of the gospel had always associated the certainty of present and future salvation, making this the motive for obedience to the new Christian law of life (§ 6, 2; 7, 4). They had taught nothing but what the Lord had taught them; nor professed anything but what He Himself had attested (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, III. 9, 1; 17, 4, comp. Tertull., *de Præscr. Hær.*, 6; "acceptam a Christo disciplinam fideliter assignaverunt," comp. chap. 21). Their doctrine, as transmitted to the Churches, now took its place beside the normative authority of the Old Testament and the Lord's words, or directly supplanted the latter.¹ The consciousness that their announcement was at first oral and only afterwards committed by them to writings, is still present (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, III. 1, 1, comp. Tert., *de Præscr. Hær.*, 21). Even if they had left no writing, the tradition of their teachings would certainly be found in the Churches, since as a matter of fact they have been faithfully preserved in many Churches among foreigners (III. 4, 1 f.). This transmitted

¹ This threefold norm is continually repeated by Irenæus: *προφήται ἐκήρυξαν, ὁ κύριος ἐδίδαξεν, ἀπόστολοι παρέδωκαν* (*adv. Hær.*, I. 8, 1), or more fully: "lex annuntiat, prophetæ præconant, Christus revelat, apostoli tradunt, ecclesia credit" (II. 30, 9). But Serapion already says (apud Euseb., 6, 12), *τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς Χριστόν*; therefore it may simply mean, that the teaching of the Church has its witness, "a prophetis et ab apostolis et ab omnibus discipulis" (III. 24, 1, comp. Tert., *adv. Hermog.*, 45: "prophetæ et apostoli non ita tradunt"). The *ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδοσις* proceeds from the holy apostles, the tradition handed down by them and the teachers is a *θεία παράδοσις* (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 1, 1; 7, 16), for which reason the apostles are directly put on a line with the prophets (1, 9), and the law transmitted through them, with that given by Moses (*Pædag.* 3, 12).

doctrine derived from the apostles and preserved in the Churches now forms the Canon, *i.e.* the normal authority by which true doctrine is to be determined.

The word *κανών* originally denotes a measure, rule, norm (Gal. vi. 16; 2 Cor. x. 13, comp. 1 Clem. 1, 3, *ἐν τῷ κανόνι τ. ὑποταγῆς*, 41, 1: τὸν ὠρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας κανόνα). Already in 1 Clem. 7, 2, the *σεμνὸς τῆς παραδόσεως κανών* is the rule handed down to us, by which to determine what is good and well-pleasing in the eyes of God. In Polycrates of Ephes. (Euseb., *H.E.*, 5, 24), the *κανών τῆς πίστεως*, is not yet the rule to determine what to believe, but the rule pertaining to faith, *i.e.* to believers, which determines ecclesiastical usage solely in accordance with the gospel. The expression is now first applied to the rule of doctrine. "In ea regula incedimus," says Tertullian, "quam ecclesia ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a deo tradidit (*de Præscr.*, 37); this is the "regula fidei a Christo instituta" cap. 13 (comp. *de carne Chr.*, 2: "si christianus es, crede quod traditum est ab eis quorum fuit tradere"). In Irenæus too the *κανών τ. ἀληθείας*, is the faith which the Church has received from the apostles and their disciples (*adv. Hær.*, I. 9, 4, comp. 10, 1), and in Clement ὁ *σεμνὸς τῆς παραδόσεως κανών* is the *κανών τῆς ἐκκλησίας* (*Strom.* 1, 1; 7, 17), the *κανών τ. πίστεως* (4, 15).

2. Though Jewish Christianity, in isolating itself from the collective Church, might justly retain the consciousness of being still in some way connected with the apostolic time and its traditions, yet Gnosis must have been aware that it was trying to put forward views foreign to those prevailing in the Church, and even in many cases opposed to them. But it could only prove these to be Christian by showing their connection with primitive Christianity, and the simplest way to do this was by appealing on its own behalf to an oral tradition proceeding from the apostles, but preserved in its own circles alone.¹ It was easy indeed for the Church

¹ Ptolemæus in his epistle to Flora also appeals to the ἀποστολική παράδοσις, ἣν ἐκ διαδοχῆς καὶ ἡμεῖς παρειλήφαμεν πάντας τοὺς λόγους κανονίσει τῇ τοῦ σωτήρος διδασκαλίᾳ (Epiph., *Hær.*, 33, 7). Thus Basilides appealed to the Apostle Matthias (*Philosoph.*, 7, 20), or to his teacher Glaukias, who, as the *ἐρμηνεύς* of Peter transmitted his doctrine to him; Valentine to a certain Theodas, who is supposed to have been a *γνωριμὸς* of Paul (Clem., *Strom.* 7, 17), the Ophites to a woman of the name of Marianne, who received her doctrine from James the brother of the

Fathers in opposition to lay claim, on behalf of the tradition alive in the Church, to the only proveable apostolic origin. When Clement represented the true Gnosis as *γνώσις ἡ κατὰ διαδοχὰς εἰς ὀλίγους ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀγράφως παραδοθεῖσα κατελήλυθεν* (*Strom.* 6, 7), Irenæus based the certainty of the genuine transmission of apostolic doctrine in the Church on the "successiones presbyterorum," which could be followed up to the apostles (*adv. Hær.*, II. 2, 2; 3, 1); Tertullian, on the testimony of the Churches founded by the apostles, which have the "tradux fidei et semina doctrinæ," and on their wider plantings (*de Præscr. Hær.*, 20, comp. *adv. Marc.*, 1, 21; 4, 5). But they constantly appealed to the unanimity of the tradition of the Church, as contrasted with the manifold diversities of error (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, I. 10, 1 f.; II. 27, 1. Tert., *de Præscr. Hær.*, 20; 28; 32; Clem., *Strom.* 7, 17: *μία ἡ πάντων γέγονε τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡσπερ διδασκαλία, οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἡ παράδοσις*), and to its greater age in opposition to the deviation from it that had come in later. The errorists made their appearance long after the bishops to whom the apostles handed over the Churches (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, V. 20, 1), and were unable to prove the apostolic origin of their Churches (Tert., 32); truth is the earlier, heresy the later (*de Præscr. Hær.*, 30, *adv. Marc.*, 1, 1, comp. Clem., *Strom.* 7, 16, Iren., *adv. Hær.*, I, 21, 5).²

Lord (*Philosoph.*, 5, 7; 10, 9). They maintained that the Apostles "non omnia revelasse, quædam secreto et paucis demandasse" (Tert., *de Præscr. Hær.*, 25), or, like the Gnostic *πίστις σοφία*, they appeal to a secret tradition which went back to Christ Himself (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, I. 25, 5; II. 27, 2 f.; III. 2, 1).

² How much self-deception underlay this defence of apostolic tradition! since the more rigid Church organization, which based its claim on the apostolic succession of the bishops, itself originated as a weapon in the struggle against heresy; but there can be no doubt that the heretical tendencies were found in opposition to what was accounted apostolic doctrine in the Churches of antiquity, and that their appeal to particular and secret traditions was not able to shake the Church in its certainty that the doctrinal views current in it went back to the oral tradition of apostolic teaching.

3. Thus the heretics were first compelled to go back to the written memorials of the apostolic time in the hope, by changing and perverting their meaning, of being able to prove from them, that the doctrines in which they differed from the traditional teaching of the Church, were apostolic. It was only necessary to carry over to the Gospels and the apostolic writings the allegorical method of interpretation of the Old Testament which was current in the Church itself. The fact that they first applied this treatment to the apostolic writings, making these the basis of their views, as the normal authority on doctrine, is adequately explained on the ground that the Church, fully conscious of being in possession of apostolic doctrine handed down from oral tradition, had no need to verify it by going back to isolated transmitted writings of the apostles, while the heretics could only justify their departure from the traditional doctrine of the Church, by seeking to give it a foundation in these written memorials. The fact itself, however, is established beyond a doubt, by the close analogy between the Old Testament and the New Testament citations of Scripture contained in the *Philosophumena*, in the excerpts from the works of Theodotus (following the works of Clem. of Alex.), and in the letter of Ptolemy to Flora (*apud Epiph. Hær.*, 33).¹ It is also confirmed by the circumstance that an interest in exegesis first sprang up in heretical circles. Only if the

¹ It is therefore quite unimportant how far it can be proved with certainty that the extracts in the *Philosophumena* proceed from direct works of Basilides, Valentine, and other of the oldest Gnostics, since even the flourishing period of their disciples, and consequently the writings belonging to them, fall into a time in which a similar use of the New Testament writings was not yet thought of among historians (comp. upon this point Jakobi in the *deutsche Zeitschr. f. christl. Wiss.*, 1851, 28, etc.; 1853, 24, etc.; Scholten, *die ältesten Zeugnisse betreffend die Schriften des N. Test.*, translated by Manchot, Bremen, 1867; Hofstede de Groot, *Basilides als erster Zeuge für Alter und Autorität der NTlichen Schriften*, Leipzig, 1868; G. Heinrici, *die valentinianische Gnosis und die h. Schrift*, Berlin, 1871).

apostolic writings were used as normative documents for the decision of questions of doctrine, could it become necessary to fix the meaning of their statements exegetically, or to prove in an exegetical way that they contained the doctrines for which their attestation was desired. Thus Basilides wrote twenty-four books ἐξηγητικά on the Gospel, the Valentinian Heracleon, the first commentary on John's Gospel (comp. also Harnack, *Marcion's Commentar zum Evangelium* in Brieger's *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, IV. 4). Thus it is shown that Tatian, who in his Greek discourse has but few echoes of the apostolic writings (§ 7, 7), influenced by the heresy of his day, made repeated perversions of apostolic utterances in the interest of his errors (comp. his interpretation of Gal. vi. 8, *ap. Hieron.*, on this passage, and of 1 Cor. xv. 22, *ap. Iren. adv. Hær.*, III. 23, 8). They are constantly upbraided by the Church Fathers for their arbitrary exegesis by means of which they put into the words of Scripture a meaning consistent with their own doctrines.² Yet they were right in maintaining that only ὁ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινη ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατέχων could understand the true meaning of the Scriptures (*Iren., adv. Hær.*, V. 9, 4, comp.

² Comp. *Iren., adv. Hær.*, I. 3, 6: ἐφορμίζειν βιαζόμενοι τὰ καλῶς εἰρημένα τοῖς κακῶς ἐπινενομημένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν. — ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πειρῶνται τὰς ἀποδείξεις ποιεῖσθαι, παρατρέποντες τὰς ἐρμηνείας καὶ ῥαδιουργήσαντες τὰς ἐξηγήσεις, comp. 8, 1. In like manner Clem. Alex. objects to them, that they διαστρέφουσι τὰς γραφὰς πρὸς τὰς ἰδίαις ἡδοναῖς — βιαζόμενοι πρὸς ἡδοναθείας τὰς ἑαυτῶν (*Strom.* 3, 4; comp. 7, 16: τὰ— ὑπὸ τῶν μακαρίων ἀποστόλων τε καὶ διδασκάλων παραδεδομένα σοφίζονται δι' ἐτέρων περιεχειρήσεων ἀνθρωπέας διδασκαλίας). Tertullian rightly says, *de Præsc. Hær.*, 48: "Quibus fuit propositum aliter docendi, eos necessitas cogit aliter disponendi instrumenta doctrinæ." Thus it is said of them, that they "scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt" (*Iren., adv. Hær.*, III. 12, 12; comp. Tert., *de Præsc. Hær.*, 17). Hence Tertullian declares it to be a mere pretence when Valentinus "integro instrumento uti videtur," whilst he in reality "plus abstulit et plus adjecit auferens proprietates singulorum quoque verborum et adjiciens dispositiones non comparantium rerum" (*de Præsc. Hær.*, 38).

Clem., *Strom.* 6, 15: τῶν γραφῶν ἐξήγησιν κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα ἐκδεχόμενοι, who finds this ἐκκλ. καν. in the συννωδία καὶ συμφωνία νόμου τε καὶ προφητῶν τῇ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδομένη διαθήκη); that only where the *veritas fidei Christianæ* existed, would the *veritas expositionum* also be found (*Tert., de Præsc. Hær.*, 19). For just as certainly as this fundamental principle, if adopted as a universal exegetical Canon, must prove misleading, so certainly had a time whose conscious belief still rested on living apostolic tradition, a right to make this the criterion for the understanding of the apostolic memorials. But it was clear that little was gained in this way, when there was a going back from oral traditional doctrine to the Scripture documents of apostolic times. The dispute turned on the right interpretation of the latter, and this again could only be finally determined by an appeal to the former. For this reason Tertullian will by no means admit the heretics to the *disputatio de scripturis*, because the *possessio scripturarum* does not belong to them (*de Præscr. Hær.*, 15, 16): “non ad scripturas provocandum est nec in his constituendum certamen, in quibus aut nulla aut incerta victoria est” (chap. 19). Just because the appeal to the apostolic written memorials originated with the heretics, did the Church hesitate to follow in their footsteps.

4. But even the heretics were soon convinced that they could make little way by their perversion of Scripture, and had recourse to the falsification of it. Dionysius of Corinth complains (apud Euseb., 4, 23) of the falsification (ῥαδιουργῆσαι) of the Gospels by omissions and additions, as Clement of Alexandria of their μετατιθέειν (*Strom.* 4, 6; comp. Origen's complaint of the μεταχαράσσειν of the Valentinians, *contra Cels.*, 2, 27, as well as of Apelles, who *evangelia purgavit*, of which he is also accused by Epiph., *Hær.*, 44, 4). Of Tatian, we are told that he τινὰς φωνὰς τοῦ ἀποστόλου μεταφράσαι, ὡς ἐπιδιορθούμενον αὐτῶν τὴν τῆς φράσεως σύνταξιν

(Euseb., *H. E.*, 4, 29), and Tertullian makes a general complaint of the *adjectiones* and *detractiones* of the heretics (*de Præsc. Hær.*, 17, 38). Thus arose the heretical remodellings of the Canonical Gospels, such as the so-called Gospel to the Hebrews which in its later forms already approaches a harmonistic elaboration of our Gospels, the *εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Αἰγυπτίους*, which Clement expressly excludes from the transmitted Gospels (*Strom.* 3, 9, 13), and the Gospel of Peter (comp. § 7, 6). How far the *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Βασιλειῶν* and the *Evang. Veritatis* of the later Valentinians were remodellings of this character or original fabrications like the so-called apocryphal Gospels, we do not know. That such were not wanting is shown by Irenæus, who speaks of a *ἐμύθητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν ἃς αὐτοὶ ἔπλασαν* (*adv. Hær.*, I. 20, 1, comp. Epiphanius, *Hær.*, 30, 23). The so-called pseudo-Clementine literature unquestionably belongs to this category, not only in the forms of it which are still extant, but also in its foundations which can only be determined conjecturally. We have here a bold attempt to falsify the *κανὼν τῆς ἐκκλησίας* or *τῆς ἀληθείας*, which is always spoken of in this connection, by communicating sayings of Peter with a precise attestation of the origin of this tradition, and putting into his mouth the doctrinal views peculiar to the author or to the tendency to which he belongs, connecting them moreover with words of the Lord in our four Gospels. To this literature, which is itself a kind of imitation of the Acts of the Apostles, apocryphal Acts are attached, such as the gnostic Acts of John and Andrew, which have to some extent rather the character of the so-called apocryphal Gospels, but which are mainly characterized by a tendency to fable. Of a fabrication of doctrinal works under apostolic names, we shall hear more in the Muratorian Canon (§ 10, 2; comp. also Serapion, apud Euseb., 6, 12). But all this literary activity could have little influence on the Church, which was conscious

of possessing the *veritas scripturarum*, the *authentice littere*, from which it rejected this *adulteratio scripturarum* (Tert., *de Præsc. Hær.*, 19; 36; 38).¹ The fact that heretical views were prominent in alleged early written memorials, could not blind her to what was foreign and contradictory in them, for the very reason that the Church had by no means derived her own views in the first instance from written monuments, but from a living oral tradition which was to her the criterion of all professedly genuine documents. How earnestly she guarded against the admixture of anything spurious may be seen from the example of that Asiatic presbyter who composed the *Acta Pauli et Theclæ*, and though maintaining that love to Paul had been his motive, was yet deposed (Tert., *de Bapt.*, 17).

5. After this only one step remained for heresy to take viz. to break with apostolic authority altogether. Even the Church itself always recognised prophetic authority side by side with apostolic; but the gift of prophecy was not limited to the divine men of the old covenant, whose prophecies were recorded in O. T. Scripture; it lived in the Church. The Apocalypse was indeed the first writing of the kind to which Justin appealed (§ 7, 4), prophetic utterances of Paul were the first that had been quoted (§ 7, 7); even the Shepherd of Hermas had appeared clothed with prophetic

¹ At the most, slighter remodellings of the Gospels, which were more difficult of detection, might hold their ground in the Church for a long time, as the history of Peter's Gospel shows (apud Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 12; comp. § 7, 6), the more readily because they proceeded from a time when even the Church did not consider itself bound to a particular form of the Lord's words, when oral tradition with its free and living capacity for form advanced side by side with written tradition and itself unsuspectingly added many a trait to the life-picture of the Lord, which was in keeping only with later representation. But as soon as this heretical remodelling advanced so far as to introduce its peculiar views that stood in opposition to the living image of the Lord in the Church and to His doctrine handed down by the apostles, or as soon as this foreign stamp was impressed on the new fabrications *à priori*, the Church was obliged to reject them.

authority. Hence Basilides feigned to have received his wisdom from two prophets, with whose barbaric names he imposed on his hearers (Euseb., *H. E.*, 4, 7), hence Mark the Valentinian professed to have received a special revelation respecting the Tetras (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, I. 14, 1); and thus we can understand how they were able to lay claim to a wisdom with which neither a Peter nor a Paul could compare (13, 6). But there was yet another way of setting up a peculiar authority not only side by side with that of the apostles but even in opposition to it. Already in apostolic times there was a party which refused to recognise Paul as an apostle, and this party found its consistent development only in heretical Jewish Christianity. They continued to repudiate Paul as an apostate, and therefore as a matter of course rejected his writings also, as well as those of Luke, adhering solely to the Gospel of Matthew (*adv. Hær.*, I. 26, 2; III. 15, 1; comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 27).¹ The ultra-Pauline Marcion could appeal on the other hand to the Epistle to the Galatians in order to prove that the primitive apostles were unworthy of trust (Tert., *adv. Marc.*, 4, 3), because they mixed up *legalia* with the words of the Redeemer (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, III. 2, 2). Hence the way was paved for subjecting apostolic authority itself to criticism and thus for rejecting it as such.²

¹ Epiphanius says that they possessed an Acts of their own, in which James played the principal part, while it contained much that was hostile to Paul (*Hær.*, 30, 16); but the Pseudo-Clementines was a work of this kind, in which James appeared as the highest authority of the Church, and Paul was attacked by Peter, under the mask of Simon Magus (comp. No. 4). According to Euseb., *H. E.*, 4, 29, the Severians also rejected the Epistles of Paul and the Acts, as the Cerinthians had already rejected the apostle Paul entirely (Epiph., *Hær.*, 28, 5).

² They want to be *emendatores* of the apostles, they turn to the criticism of the "scripturarum ipsarum quasi non recte habeant neque sint ex autoritate" (III. 1, 1; 2, 1), they stipulate "quasdam scripturas recipere, alias" (scil. opinioni resistentes) rejicere" (Tert., *de Præscr. Hær.*, 17; *de Carne Chr.*, 3) under all kinds of lying pretexts (Clem., *Strom.* 7, 16). Thus Jerome, in the *Præf. ad Tit.*, relates that Tatian rejected some of

6. Granting that the Ebionites drew their origin from a time when the Gospel of Matthew alone held a paramount place even in the Church, its tradition being decisive (§ 5, 6), and supposing it to be certain that Valentine himself made impartial use of the ecclesiastical Gospels (No. 3, note 2), yet Marcion deliberately rejected those Gospels which proceeded from the primitive apostolic circle, for the very reason that they went back to the authority of the primitive apostles which he refused to recognise (Tert., *adv. Marc.*, 34, comp. 4, 5; *de Carne Chr.*, 2). He was therefore acquainted with them beyond a doubt, and knew that they were valid in the Church by virtue of their direct or indirect descent from the primitive apostles; but for this very reason he was obliged to reject them. By appealing to the fact that Paul speaks only of *one* Gospel and not of several, he tries to prove that one only was valid, which he does not seem to have definitely named (*adv. Marc.*, 4, 2), but which the Church Fathers rightly recognised as a mangled Gospel of Luke (Iren., I. 27, 2; III. 12, 12).¹ In accordance with his fundamental principle, moreover, he could accept no apostolic epistle proceeding from the primitive apostolic circle, but only Pauline epistles. And that he mutilated these also by removing all that was not in har-

the Pauline epistles (probably the Epistles to Timothy in particular, comp. Clem., *Strom.* 2, 11), but acknowledged the Epistle to Titus, while Basilides rejected all the Pastoral Epistles. In the *Philosophumena* (7, 37) we read that Apelles τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἢ τοῦ ἀποστόλου τὰ ἀρέσκοντα ἐαυτῷ αἰρεῖται; and Irenæus, who speaks incidentally of such as seem to have rejected the Gospel as well as the Apocalypse of John (*adv. Hær.*, III. 11, 9; comp. Epiph., *Hær.*, 51, 3), finds the *firmitas* of the Gospels confirmed by the very fact that each of the heretics selected one of them—the Ebionites Matthew, Marcion Luke, the Cerinthians Mark, the Valentinians John (*adv. Hær.*, III. 11, 7). But Marcion still remains the chief representative of this standpoint.

¹ Tertullian intimates that his pupils were always altering this Gospel afresh (*adv. Marc.*, 4, 5), for which reason the Gospel that Origen and Epiphanius found with Apelles could not have been a peculiar one, as Jerome in his *Proëm. in Matthæum* supposes, but a still further mutilated Gospel of Luke, and therefore the Gospel that his pupils afterwards designated as the Gospel of Christ absolutely.

mony with his own views, Irenæus expressly states (*adv. Hæc.*, I. 27, 2; III. 12, 12), while Tertullian remarks (*adv. Marc.*, 5, 21) that the Epistle to Philemon alone escaped Marcion's falsifying hands, on account of its brevity (more correctly, its simplicity). But we learn from the same passage that he rejected the Pastoral Epistles also, which were obviously least in sympathy with him, since their polemic was in early times referred to the Gnostic errors themselves. In this way he arrived at a fixed number of ten Pauline epistles, which he recognised solely and exclusively as normative writings, in the following order: Gal., 1st and 2nd Cor., Rom., 1st and 2nd Thess., Eph. (to which however, following Col. iv. 16, he prefixed the title *ad Laodicenses*, comp. Tert., *adv. Marc.*, 5, 11, 17), Col., Phil., and Philemon. In him therefore we first find a closed Canon of the New Testament Scriptures. This phenomenon is adequately explained by the circumstance that the heretics, in contending for their peculiar doctrines, first found it necessary to go back to the written memorials of apostolic time (No. 3), and that it soon became apparent that they could not vindicate their standpoint by them without mutilating them (No. 4), selecting and definitely curtailing such as harmonized with their own views.²

7. It was by the criticism to which apostolic authority was thus subjected at the hands of the heretics, through their falsification and rejection of apostolic writings, that the Church

² The view still adhered to by Ewald and Bleek, viz. that Marcion found a collection of Pauline epistles of this kind already in the Church, and either adopted it in its entirety, if it originally consisted only of these ten letters, or made selections from it, is utterly wanting in historical foundation. As the heretics were the first to appeal to the apostolic writings at all, so they proceeded to make a collection and limitation of those which they wished to recognise as exclusively valid. We see clearly the way in which this came about, but do not of course imply that all individual heretical tendencies made every step of this way in the same manner, either in the same order or even within certain proveable spaces of time.

first attained to a full consciousness of what she possessed in the written memorials of apostolic time, by which means these came to be ranked as equal to the Scriptures of the Old Testament. When Credner and Reuss represent that in accordance with the characteristic tendency of human nature to look at the past in an ideal light, the office and calling of the apostles gained lustre in proportion to their remoteness, this is altogether unhistorical. There was never a doubt in the Church as to the unique calling of the apostles and their special equipment for it by the Holy Ghost (§ 6, 1, 2; § 7, 4). The only new thing was that in opposition to a criticism which attacked the doctrine laid down in the apostolic writings, this spiritual equipment was made a guarantee for their perfect knowledge of truth and the infallibility of the doctrine set forth in their works. Thus these works naturally took their place beside the prophetic books of the Old Testament (Theoph., *ad Aut.*, 3, 12: διὰ τὸ τοὺς πάντας πνευματοφόρους ἐνὶ πνεύματι θεοῦ λελαληκέναι, comp. ii. 22: διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς αἱ ἄγαι γραφαὶ καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, by which, as appears from what follows, the apostles are meant); in them the Spirit had spoken through the apostles, as formerly through the prophets (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, III. 21, 4: "unus et idem spiritus dei qui in prophetis quidem pronuntiavit—ipse et in apostolis annuntiavit;" Tert., *de Pat.*, 7: "spiritus domini per apostolum pronuntiavit;" comp. Clem., *Pædag.* 1, 6: τὸ ἐν τῷ ἀποστόλῳ πνεῦμα λέγει,¹ and they began

¹ For this very reason they are "scripturæ perfectæ, quippe a verbo dei et spiritu ejus dictæ" (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, II. 28, 2; comp. 28, 3: δλων τῶν γραφῶν πνευματικῶν οὐσῶν) γραφαὶ θεόπνευστοι (Clem., *Strom.* 7, 16). "Prophetarum et domini et apostolorum voces", now stand quite on a par (*adv. Hær.*, II. 2, 6), what "scriptura aliqua retulit, apostolus dixit, dominus docuit" (28, 7). The apostolic writings, like those of the Old Testament, now come under the conception of γραφαὶ absolutely, or γραφαὶ θεῖαι (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, I. 1, 3; 6, 3; II. 27, 1; Clem., *Strom.* 2, 2; comp. Tertullian, *de Præscr. Hær.*, 39: "divina litteratura," *Apolog.*, 39: "litteræ divinæ," *adv. Hermog.*, 31: "scriptura divina"), of κυριακαὶ γραφαὶ (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, II. 30, 6; V. 20, 2: "dominicæ scripturæ"), of βίβλοι ἄγαι

to be quoted exactly like the writings of the Old Testament. The first in whom this is seen with the clearness of a principle is Theophilus of Antioch. Although he mainly interweaves free reminiscences of apostolic writings with his own composition, yet he already introduces citations from the Pauline epistles with the words *κελεύει ἡμᾶς ὁ θεῖος λόγος* (*ad Autol.*, 3, 14). So too in the Gospels, it is no longer as before the Lord speaking in them that appears as the authority,² but the apostle who writes them. A sentence of John's prologue is cited as the doctrine of the *πνευματοφόροι ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει* (*ad Autol.*, 2, 22; comp. *Iren.*, *adv. Hær.*, II, 2, 5: "quemadmodum Joannes domini discipulus ait:" Gospel i. 3; in Irenæus we read "spiritus sanctus per Matthæum ait:" *Matt.* i. 18 (*adv. Hær.*, III, 16, 2); and in Tertullian: "ipse imprimis Matthæus, fidelissimus evangelii commentator ita exorsus est:" *Matt.* i. 1 (*de Carne Christi*, 22; comp. *Clem.*, *Pædag.* 2, 1: *φησὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς*).³ But this putting of the apostolic writings on an equality with those of the Old Testament must have found immediate expression

(*Clem.*, *Pæd.*, 3, 12; comp. *Tert.*, *Apol.*, 39:² "sanctæ voces"). They are called τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ (*Iren.*, *adv. Hær.*, I, 8, 1; comp. *Tert.*, *Apol.*, 32: "dei voces," *de Anim.*, 28: "sermo divinus").

² Only detached sayings of the Lord, as formerly (§ 5), are adduced. Comp. *Iren.*, *adv. Hær.*, I, 4, 3: *περὶ ὧν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν εἶρηκεν*; *Clem.*, *Pæd.* I, 5, 8: *ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ φησὶ ὁ μαρτυρεῖ ὁ κύριος*. And even where such sayings are adduced they are already authoritative as words of Scripture (*Theoph.*, *ad Autol.*, 3, 13, 14: *ἡ εὐαγγέλιος φωνὴ διδάσκει, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φησὶ*; comp. *Clem.*, *Pæd.* 1, 5: *ἡ γραφὴ λέγει ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ*), as naturally followed from the Gospel writings having been accepted as such (§ 7).

³ It is true that in Clement alone passages from apostolic epistles are directly cited as *γραφὴ* (comp. *Coh.* *ad Gent.*, 1: *φησὶ ἡ ἀποστολικὴ γραφὴ*: *Tit.* iii. 3, etc.). Among the Church Fathers at the close of the second century they are almost universally cited with the words *ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει*, his name being in most cases mentioned, while a more particular account of the epistle in which they occur is frequently given. From this it is clearly seen that it was the personal authority of the apostles which gave their writings their importance as sacred writings in the Church, and not the fact of their belonging to a collection of writings to which such importance inherently belonged.

in the fact that the former, like the latter, were read at public service, although this is only casually mentioned in Tertullian (*de Præscr. Hær.*, 36: "apud quas ipsæ authenticæ litteræ apostolorum recitantur," comp. *adv. Marc.*, 4, 5: "quid legant Philippenses, Thessalonicenses, Ephesii"). While the Gospels became sacred writings in consequence of being read in the Church (§ 7, 5), the ecclesiastical reading of the Epistles first began after they had been raised to the rank of sacred writings.

§ 9. THE NEW TESTAMENT AT THE CLOSE OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

1. When the apostolic writings were promoted to the rank of sacred books equal in importance to those of the Old Testament, there were already *novæ Scripturæ*, which, on account of their attestation of the words and history of the Lord, had taken their place beside the *veteres* (comp. Tert., *adv. Praxeam*, 24; "novæ filium dei præfiniunt"); these were the Gospels (§ 7). Hence the former received the double appellation of τὰ εὐαγγελικά καὶ τὰ ἀποστολικά, just as the latter were generally termed ὁ νόμος καὶ προφῆται (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, I. 3, 6). Of the Church it is said that she "legem et prophetas cum evangelicis et apostolicis litteris miscet" (Tert., *de Præscr.*, 36); her very certainty of possessing in apostolic tradition the κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας (§ 7, 1) consists in the συμφωνία νόμου καὶ προφητῶν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀποστόλων σὺν καὶ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (Clem., *Strom.* 7, 16; comp. 3, 11: τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν διὰ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καὶ εὐαγγελίου ὁ ἀπόστολος κηρύσσει); for which reason τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and οἱ ἀπόστολοι stand over against the prophets (*Strom.* 7, 16).¹ But since the law and

¹ In spite of this co-ordination, the consciousness that the Gospels formed the actual foundation of the new sacred Scriptures is not yet obliterated, for which reason when the Old Testament Scriptures collectively are termed the Prophets or the Law, these are frequently characterized as the Gospel (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, II. 27, 2: "universæ scripturæ divinæ,

the prophets formed a fixed whole, the Gospels and the apostolic writings could not fail soon to be regarded in the same light. Irenæus already speaks of *utraque Scriptura divina* (*adv. Hær.*, III. 19, 2), and Tertullian of *utrumque testamentum* (*adv. Marc.*, 1, 19); and the latter expressly says that the name *testamentum* (already occurring in Melito of Sardis, comp. § 7, 7) was applied to the collection of evangelical-apostolic writings, as well as to the prophetic.² Hence there is now a *Novum* in addition to the *Vetus Testamentum* (*de Præscr. Hær.*, 30), nor can it be doubted that Clement already employs ἡ παλαιὰ and ἡ νέα διαθήκη in this sense (*Strom.* 5, 13; comp. 3, 6, 11, 18; 4, 21). But the New Testament collection was still, so to speak, an indefinite quantity.³ It is true there was no doubt that the only Gospels

prophetiæ et evangelia;” Clem., *Pædag.* 1, 5: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in opposition to *προφητεία*; comp. *Strom.* 3, 9; 4, 1; Tert., *adv. Marc.*, 1, 19, where Old and New Testament stand over against one another as *lex* and *evangelium*). In like manner, the recollection is preserved that the words of the Lord originally procured for those Gospels attesting them, the rank of sacred writings, in the antithesis of *apostolicæ litteræ* and *dominicæ pronunciationes* (Tert., *de Præscr. Hær.*, 4; comp. cap. 44: “dominicæ et apostolicæ scripturæ et denunciationes;” *de Bapt.*, 15: “tam ex domini evang. quam ex apost. litteris”). Comp. Iren., *adv. Hær.*, II. 2, 6: “ex ipsis apostolis et ex domini sermonibus.”

² Comp. *adv. Marc.*, 4, 1: “alterum alterius instrumenti vel quod magis usui est dicere testamenti.” The expression *instrumentum*, which occurs only in Tertullian, denotes means of proof in a juridical sense. The apostolic writings are the *instrumenta doctrinæ* (*de Præscr. Hær.*, 38), i.e. the documents from which right doctrine may be proved. Every apostolic writing is an instrument of this kind (comp. *de Resurr. Carn.*, 33; *Instr. Joannis*, cap. 40; *Instr. Pauli, adv. Marc.*, 5, 2; *Instr. Actorum*); but just as the prophets collectively form such an instrument (*de Res. Carn.*, 33) as also the Gospels (*adv. Marc.*, 4, 2), so likewise do the various *instrumenta apostolica* (*de Res. Carn.*, 39) form such a one. Finally all Holy Scripture is “totum instrumentum utriusque testamenti” (*adv. Præscr.*, 20).

³ That there were two closed collections called τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and ὁ ἀπόστολος respectively, as Eichhorn and Bertholdt, Schott and de Wette, and to some extent even Reuss, assume, is an obvious error, since the former denotes not merely the four Gospels, but the contents of the New Testament Scriptures in general, as opposed to the Old (comp.

were the four traditional ones (§ 7, 6); but we shall see from what motive the Acts, which was neither an evangelical nor apostolic writing, was added to these. Moreover, the number of apostolic epistles was not definitely settled; and just as the Apocalypse was almost universally joined with the Gospels, so too other writings that were neither apostolic nor yet epistles, were cited and reckoned as belonging to the New Testament. A closer examination of the sacred writings acknowledged by Irenæus, Clement and Tertullian will show that at this time there was not yet an exclusive collection of apostolic writings, viz. a closed Canon in our sense, and will explain the reason of this.⁴ It was only as a substitute for the oral teaching of the apostles that the evangelical and apostolic writings collectively assumed the form of a Canon by which to determine what pertained to truth and faith and what was at variance with them. But we find no definite statement as to the individual writings belonging to it: there is a closed *evangelicum instrumentum*, it is true, but not an *apostolicum* (comp. Note 2). Comp. Rönsch, *Das Neue Testament Tertullians*, Leipz. 1871.

2. It must not be overlooked that the two portions of which the New Testament consisted at the close of the second

Note 1). That citations are so often made with the words *ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει*, especially in Clement (§ 8, 7; Note 3), is accounted for simply on the ground that it was the apostle Paul whose numerous writings were chiefly used, and who is therefore spoken of as the Apostle absolutely (comp. *Strom.* 7, 3), while reference is incidentally made to John i. 17 in the words *κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον* (*Quis Dives Salvus*, 8).

⁴ When Clement speaks of an *εὐαγγελικὸς κανὼν* (*Strom.* 3, 9), it is the *κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας* (§ 7, 1), inasmuch as it is taken from the New Testament writings (Note 1; comp. Tert., *de Præscr. Hær.*, 36: "legem et prophetas cum evang. et apostol. litteris miscet, inde potat fidem"). In the same sense Irenæus says that John, in the prologue to his Gospel, tried "regulam veritatis constituere in ecclesia" (*adv. Hær.*, III. 11, 1), and calls the writings of the apostles "fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ" (III. 1, 1). When he says that we have the *sermones dei* as *regula veritatis* (IV. 35, 4), we know that the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament are meant as well as the Gospels and the apostolic writings (§ 8, 7).

century, had been formed from totally different points of view. Where the apostolic writings were concerned, the question turned on the written memorials of the men who by virtue of their calling and equipment had the sole right of decision as to what alone was the true doctrine of Christ. On the other hand, where the evangelical writings were concerned, the point in question was, what Gospels had been current in the Church from early times as trustworthy documents, in which the words and life of the Lord would be authentically transmitted; by which it was not intended originally to cast any reflection on the person of their authors. But as soon as these two parts were made into a whole, it became necessary to consider this whole from the same point of view from which a New Testament collection of sacred books had taken its place side by side with those of the Old Testament, *i.e.* it was necessary to examine how far the Gospels belonging to it contained genuine apostolic tradition. This is the point of view taken up by Irenæus in his disquisitions respecting the origin of the four Gospels (*adv. Hæc.*, III. 1, 1), according to which Mark, ὁ μαθητῆς καὶ ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου (comp. also 10, 6) τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παρέδωκεν, and Luke, ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. Moreover, following Luke i. 2, he emphasizes the fact that the latter "quæ ab apostolis didicerat, tradidit nobis" (14, 2, comp. 10, 1). It is Tertullian who more than any other with far-reaching acuteness, makes the authoritative statement, "evangelicum instrumentum apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangelii promulgandi ab ipso domino sit impositum" (*adv. Marc.*, 4, 2). But the four traditional Gospels were not in harmony with this standpoint (comp. Clem., *Strom.* 3, 13), since two of them unquestionably proceeded only from apostolic disciples;¹ and yet the

¹ It is most interesting to see how Tert. is for ever seeking to vindicate the recognition of these two, in opposition to his former principle. He

Church already felt herself bound by this tradition (§ 7, 6) It is of moment for the history of the formation of the Canon, that the impossibility of carrying out the principle of apostolicity, which properly speaking was of necessity involved in the idea of a Canon, was thus demonstrated *à priori*.

3. But Luke's Acts of the Apostles also belonged to those writings which were highly prized by the Church on account of their value as early documents, and the recognition of which she must see to be absolutely assured. For the outpouring of the Spirit on the apostles, which was the foundation of all the importance now attached to their writings, for the apostolic authority of Paul, whose works always formed the chief mass of the *ἀποστολικά*, for the founding of the Church in general, and that of the apostolic Churches in particular, whose position was now one of such decided importance (§ 8, 2), this book was in the eyes of the Church of that time the sole means of proof.¹ Yet it neither pro-

first appeals to the fact that the "prædicatio discipulorum suspecta fieri possit de gloriæ studio, si non adstat illi auctoritas magistrorum, immo Christi qui magistros apostolos fecit." Then he urges that, "nobis fidem ex apostolis Johannes et Matthæus insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant, iisdem regulis exorsi" (*adv. Marc.*, 4, 2). . Finally, he comes to the conclusion that "apud universas (ecclesias) evangelium Lucæ ab initio editionis suæ stare. Eadem auctoritas ecclesiarum apostolicarum ceteris quoque patrocinabitur evangeliiis, quæ proinde per illas et secundum illas habemus, Joannis dico et Matthæi, licet et Marcus quod edidit, Petri affirmetur, cujus interpretes Marcus. Nam et Lucæ digestum Paulo adscribere solent. Capit magistrorum videri quæ discipuli promulgarint" (4, 5).

¹ Hence Irenæus regards it as providential that much of Luke's Gospel has been communicated by him alone, since the heretics neither can nor will give this up, because they are thus compelled to recognise the "testificatio des Lucas de actibus et doctrina apostolorum," in particular the calling of Paul to be an apostle (*adv. Hær.*, III, 15, 1). Tertullian points out to them that they can know nothing whatever of the Holy Ghost and of the Church which they wish to defend, without the Actus Apostolorum (as Irenæus also incidentally calls the book, *adv. Hær.*, III, 13, 3); and that they cannot even appeal to Paul against the primitive apostles, since they knew nothing of him whatever without

ceeded from an apostle whose authority would have justified its reception among the sacred books, nor could it be supported on the plea of early usage, like the primitive documents respecting the acts and teaching of the Lord, much less on the *à priori* assumption of a special inspiration. It is from the fact of Luke's presence as an eye-witness of the most important parts of the life of Paul, from the way in which he is accredited by Paul and in which the composition of the Gospel is entrusted to him, that Irenæus proves his credibility (*adv. Hær.*, III. 14, 1), as Tertullian proves it from his agreement with Paul (*adv. Marc.*, 5, 2; comp. *Iren.*, *adv. Hær.*, III. 13, 3). Clement of Alexandria also employs the *πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων* chiefly as an historical source (*Pædag.* 2, 1; comp. *Strom.* 1, 18, 19, 23), but even as such it was absolutely indispensable to the Church; and when the writings recognised by the Church as authoritative were put together in the New Testament, it was necessarily included among them, although not fully coinciding with the standpoint to which either part owed its recognition. Thus a second point was raised on which every attempt to form a Canon from one initial standpoint must have foundered, even if the matter had been made a subject of reflection.²

4. The Pauline epistles naturally form the larger portion

this book, his own testimony not being sufficient (*de Præscr. Hær.*, 22, 23).

² But Clement was also acquainted with a *κῆρυγμα Πέτρου*, which, like the Acts, must have given an account of the sayings and doings of Peter; and since he holds the tradition therein contained to be authentic, he might just as well have quoted it as the other (*Strom.* 1, 29; 2, 15; 5, 5; 6, 15) and have received it into his New Testament, although the West seems to know nothing of it. On the other hand it does not follow from *Strom.* 2, 9 that he acknowledged the *παράδοσεις* of Matthias in the same way (comp. § 7, 6, note 2). It does not at all appear that his saying which he mentions in 5, 4 is taken from this writing, or that the heretics who appealed to him (7, 17), made use of it, for which reason, moreover, it cannot be concluded from this passage that he rejected it.

of those apostolic writings which go to make up the New Testament.¹ In Irenæus, Tertullian and Clement, twelve Pauline epistles are expressly cited, *i.e.* are handed down collectively under his name, with the exception of the Epistle to Philemon, which, on account of its brevity and the doctrinal unimportance of its contents, offered no inducement for such classification. For we learn quite incidentally from Tertullian that he was nevertheless well acquainted with it (comp. *adv. Marc.*, 5, 21 and with it § 8, 6). But it does not by any means appear that they had these epistles before them in the form of a concluded collection and in fixed succession.² On the contrary we see how in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews views differed even as to the works that proceeded from Paul. By Clement who regarded it as Pauline at least in its alleged Hebraic basis (Euseb., *H.E.*, 6, 14), it is frequently cited in closest connection with passages in other Pauline epistles (comp. *Strom.* 2, 2; 6, 8; 7, 1). Theophilus has merely an allusion to the contrast of milk and strong meat (2, 25, comp. Heb. v. 12), while Irenæus shows no trace of it.³ There is in

¹ In Theophilus of Antioch, only *one* express citation occurs, in which Tit. iii. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 1 f. are connected with Rom. xiii. 7 f. (*ad Autol.*, 3, 14); but references, more or less plain, are found to almost all the others; and the fact that we find no trace of the Galatian or 2nd Thessalonian Epistle as well as Philemon, has no significance whatever.

² Attempts like those made by Credner and Volkmar, to prove from Tertullian where he goes over the Holy Scriptures, that a collection of this kind did exist, are all in vain, since in his account of the books he never adheres to the same number, much less the same order. That the unknown saying of Paul quoted by Clement (*Strom.* 6, 5) proceeds from an apocryphal or lost writing, is scarcely probable. Like the saying of Matthias (No. 3, note 2) it may have had its origin in oral tradition.

³ True, he is said to have mentioned it and quoted some passages from it in a work that has been lost to us (Euseb., *H.E.*, 5, 26: *μνημονεύει ῥητά τινα ἐξ αὐτῶν παραθέμενος*), but from the fact that in his attack on the heretics he nowhere makes use of an epistle so valuable on account of its doctrine, it only follows the more certainly how far he was from regarding it as Pauline or even apostolic.

fact no reason to doubt the statement of Stephen Gobar in the sixth century (*ap. Phot. Bibl.*, cod. 232) that he declares it to be non-pauline. Moreover it is evident that Tertullian is quite unaware that anybody holds it to be Pauline; he knows it only as an Epistle of Barnabas, of a "vir satis auctoratus, qui ab apostolis didicit et cum apostolis docuit," and hints that it is received by many of the Churches. But however highly he values the epistle, and however well it suits his purpose, yet he will only "nur ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum" (*de Pudic.*, 20). In his view, therefore, the Epistle to the Hebrews is not a sacred book of the New Testament, because it does not belong to the apostolic writings; and the fact that it was already received by many in his circle, only proves that when the works of apostolic disciples had once been admitted into the New Testament (No. 2, 3), the principle of recognising only apostolic works as authoritative, was no longer firmly adhered to, even in contrast to epistolary literature.

5. Still less can we suppose that there was a concluded collection of writings proceeding from the circle of the primitive apostles, such as, in Ewald's opinion, was joined to the collection of Pauline letters in the beginning of the century. True, it is admitted as a matter of course that the first Epistle of *Peter*, which was already known to the Roman Clement and was used by Polycarp and Papias (§ 6, 7), was already reckoned with the apostolic epistles. It is expressly cited, sometimes repeatedly, by Irenæus (*adv. Hær.*, IV. 16, 5, comp. 1 Pet. ii. 16), Tertullian (*Scarp.* 12, comp. 1 Pet. ii. 20, etc.) and Clement (*Pædag.*, I. 6, comp. 1 Pet. ii. 1-3). On the other hand they show no trace of the second Epistle of Peter.¹ So also it may be taken for

¹ The fact that Irenæus quotes the first: "Petrus ait in epistola sua (*adv. Hær.*, IV. 9, 2), and Clement: ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ (*Strom.* 3,

granted that the first Epistle of *John*, which together with the Gospel, was obviously known from the beginning (§ 5, 7), was reckoned as part of the New Testament by the Fathers at the end of the second century; and the fact that no reminiscence of it is found in Theophilus can only be accidental. But Irenæus repeatedly cites it as Johannine (*adv. Hær.*, III. 16, 8, comp. 1 John iv. 1 ff.; v. 1), likewise Tertullian (*adv. Prax.*, 15, comp. 1 John i. 1), and Clement (*Pædag.* III. 11, comp. 1 John iv. 7; v. 3; ii. 3-6); and in Irenæus and Clement a second is joined with it.² The fact that the third Epistle is never quoted does not prove that it was still unknown to these Church Fathers, if we take into account its brevity and the doctrinal unimportance of its contents; but neither can the contrary be proved. It is more remarkable that the Epistle of James, already so much used by Hermas (§ 6, 4), and from which Theophilus (*ad. Autol.*, I, 2) seems to copy, should never be quoted. In the case of Irenæus and Tertullian it may indeed be accounted for simply by assuming that they did not look upon the author of the epistle as an apostle, and correctly so; but in

18), if we take into account the way in which the Church Fathers expressed themselves, does not indeed prove that they were not acquainted with a second one by him (*vid. infra*); but a citation from so important an epistle could not be wanting had they known it, while even the remarkable echo of the whole context of 2 Pet. ii. 4-7 in Iren., *adv. Hær.*, IV. 36, 4, cannot be proved, for want of the Greek text. Yet the *ἀθέμιτος εἰδωλολατρεία* (1, 14; 2, 34) and the *πλάνη πατροπαράδοτος* (2, 24) in Theophilus form a scarcely mistakeable reference to 1 Pet. iv. 3; i. 18, while the alleged echoes of 2 Pet. i. 19, ff. (2, 9. 13) prove nothing.

² It is quite clear in this case that the citation-formula, "in epistola sua testificatus est" (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, III. 16, 5), does not exclude the knowledge of a second Epistle: for in I. 16, 3, Irenæus expressly cites 2 John 11; though in III. 16, 8 (in prædicta epistola) he erroneously attributes the passage 2 John 7, etc. to the first Epistle, where something similar is at least to be found. So too Clement (*Strom.* 3, 4) cites the passage 1 John i. 6 f. with the words *φησὶν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ*, and on the other hand the passage 1 John v. 16, with the words *ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ*, thus showing plainly that he knows at least one smaller one. But no trace of either is found in Tertullian.

Tertullian no trace of an acquaintance with it can be shown, though such acquaintance is not quite improbable, at least in the case of Irenæus.³ On the other hand Clement, who neither cites it nor shows any reminiscence of it, can scarcely have been acquainted with it, since he does not, as has frequently been supposed, identify the brother of the Lord with the apostle James, though he undoubtedly reckons him an apostle in the wide sense and as belonging to the true Gnostics (comp. Euseb., *H.E.*, 2, 1, and with it § 36, 2; also *Strom.* 1, 1; 6, 8), to whom Christ originally committed the truth, and therefore he had no reason for excluding a work by him from the apostolic collection.⁴ The Epistle of *Jude*,

³ When in Tert., *adv. Jud.*, 2, we read that "Abraham amicus dei deputatus est," this view, taken from Isa. xli. 8; 2 Chron. xx. 7 and characteristic of Philo, the Book of Jubilees, and certainly of all Jewish tradition, had already become current among Christian authors (comp. 1 Clem. ad Cor. 10, 1; 17, 2, and after him in Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* 3, 2, and frequently in the *Strom.*), so that the mediation of James ii. 23 was by no means necessary. All other reminiscences professedly discovered are entirely wanting in proof. It is quite different with Irenæus, for though *adv. Hær.*, IV. 13, 4, might easily be explained in the same way, the combination with Gen. xv. 6 in IV. 16, 2 leads to a verbal reproduction of Jas. iv. 23, so that the assumption of acquaintance with this passage is difficult to controvert. But in this case the "factum initium facturæ" (V. 1, 1) might also be a reminiscence of Jas. i. 18.

⁴ All that has been brought forward, apart from the designation of Abraham as the friend of God (comp. note 3), to prove a knowledge of the Epistle of James, such as the corresponding turn of the expression in Matt. v. 37 and Jas. v. 12, the designation of him who fulfils the law of love as βασιλικός (comp. Jas. ii. 8), and the ἀποκνηθείς of regeneration (comp. Jas. i. 18), is not decisive. Eusebius indeed asserts (*H.E.*, 6, 14), that Clement in the Hypotyposes gave a short explanation of the whole ἐνδιαθήκη γραφή, μὴδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγόμενας παρελθῶν, τῆν Ἰουδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς, but this very mention of the Epistle of Jude makes it most improbable that Eusebius actually referred to all seven; and the way in which Photius (*Bibl. cod.*, 109) speaks of explanations of the Pauline and Catholic Epistles is too general to lead us to the conclusion that he explained *all*. In the *Adumbrationes* (taken according to Zahn from the Hypotyposes, comp. *Forschungen zur Geschichte des NTlichen Kanon*, 3, Erlang, 1884) as a matter of fact we find explanations only of 1 Pet., Jude, 1 and 2 John, whose use in Clement can be directly proved; and when Cassiodorus in the *Instit. Divin. Lect.*, chap. 8,

of which as yet we have found no trace, is neither mentioned nor made use of by Irenæus; Tertullian only remarks incidentally that "Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet" (*de Cultu Fem.*, 1, 3), from which we see that he counted it a sacred writing, and also looked upon its author as an apostle. Clement quotes it repeatedly (*Pædag.* 3, 2; *Strom.* 3, 2), and treats it as a prophetic warning of the heresies of his time; but it does not at all appear that he identified the author with one of the Twelve, as Tertullian seems to have done. Nevertheless he may have looked upon this brother of the honoured James, who as the $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ addresses the Church, as an apostle in the wider sense. We have here but another argument against the existence of a closed collection of apostolic epistles, since the circle of apostles was not yet strictly limited. Just as in the Didache, the travelling evangelists are still called apostles (comp. also Hermas Sim. IX. 15, 4 and with it § 6, 1), so too Clement calls the Roman Clement an apostle (*Strom.* 4, 17) and Barnabas too (*Strom.* 2, 6 f.), although on another occasion he terms him an ἀποστολικός, who was one of the Seventy and a co-worker with the apostle Paul (2, 20; comp. 5, 10, and the passage from the Hypotyposes apud Euseb., *H.E.*, 2, 1). Hence he too repeatedly cites the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (*Strom.* 1, 7; 5, 12; 6, 8), as well as the Epistle of Barnabas (2, 15), like any other New Testament writing. But even apart from the way in which Clement, by the extended conception of an apostle, was thus included in the category, writings of apostolic disciples were also as a matter of fact received among the sacred books, along with the Gospels and the Acts; and although their normal character was

names these very epistles as explained in the Hypotyposes, and only by an obvious error substitutes the Epistle of James for that of Jude, his more special account undoubtedly corrects and modifies that of Eusebius.

finally made to rest upon the authentication of genuine apostolic doctrine, yet it might certainly be concluded that these writings also transmitted such doctrine in a true and unadulterated form, as had formerly been the case with the oral teaching of the apostles (§ 8, 1).

6. But there was yet another point of view, under which the circle of sacred N. T. writings was still further extended. From the time of Justin the Johannine Apocalypse had belonged to the *συγγράμματα* of the Christians (§ 7, 4). It certainly proceeded from the apostle John; but it was by no means the authentication of genuine apostolic doctrine that made it so important in the eyes of the Church, but the prophecies which it contained respecting the future of the kingdom of God. Nevertheless, on account of its apostolic origin, it could not be excluded from the books which now formed the New Testament. Eusebius tells us of Theophilus (*H. E.*, 4, 24), that in his work against Hermogenes, he ἐκ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου κέχρηται μαρτυρίας (comp. *ad Autol.*, 2, 28: δαιμῶν δὲ καὶ δράκων καλεῖται with Apoc. xii. 9), and in all the Church Fathers of this time it is cited as a sacred writing, *Iren.*, *adv. Hæc.*, IV. 20, 11; V. 26, 1; *Tert.*, *de Præscr. Hæc.*, 33; *adv. Marc.*, 3, 14; 4, 5; *Clem.*, *Pæd.*, 2, 10; *Strom.* 6, 13). But Clement was also acquainted with an Apocalypse of Peter, on which, according to Eusebius (*H. E.*, 6, 14), as well as on the Epistle of Barnabas, he commented in the Hypotyposes, and which could not have had less importance in his view than the Johannine sacred writings, although it only appears to be cited in the ἐκλογαὶ ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν. And because the real value of these apocalypses, notwithstanding their apostolic origin, consisted in the prophecies which they contained, and which were warranted not by the apostolicity of their authors in the sense of § 8, 1, but by the revelations that had been granted to them, there was no reason whatever for rejecting an apocalyptic writing that did not proceed from an apostle. Thus in Clement, the

Shepherd of Hermas is frequently quoted as a sacred writing (*Strom.* 2, 9; 6, 6); it is even the *ἄγγελος τῆς μετανοίας* (ii. 17) or the *δύναμις ἢ τῷ Ἐρμᾷ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν λαλοῦσα*, which in it *θείως φησὶν* (1, 29; comp. 2. 1). Nor is there any reason why we should not accept the *καλῶς εἶπεν ἢ γραφή ἢ λέγουσα*, with which Irenæus (*adv. Hær.*, IV. 20, 2) introduces a passage of Hermas, as an actual quotation from Scripture. Although according to Tertullian the "*scriptura Pastoris, quæ sola mæchos amat*," does not deserve "*divino instrumento incidendi*" (*de Pud.*, 10), yet it is only because of his prejudice against its contents and not on fundamental grounds that he determines to reject it.¹

7. It is thus sufficiently established that the New Testament was by no means a concluded collection at the end of the second century (No. 1); but it has also been shown why this could not have been the case. Even if from the point of view that led to the origin of a New Testament, we try to come to a well-founded decision respecting what ought to belong to it, we have no premisses.¹ But it was no longer

¹ But when he says that the work "*ab omni consilio ecclesiarum inter apocrypha et falsa judicatur*," this is merely a passionate exaggeration, as in truth he himself shows when soon after he says that Barnabas's Epistle to the Hebrews (No. 4) is "*utique receptor apud ecclesias illo apocrypho pastore moschorum*" (cap. 20). For this at any rate implies that the Shepherd also was received by some, as, for example, Irenæus; nor is it at all certain that Tertullian himself (*de Oratione*, 16) only refers to it ironically, and does not rather, in his pre-Montanist time when he was still unprejudiced against it, make impartial use of it.

¹ In the first place the circle of apostolic writings was by no means uniform. Irenæus and Clement are acquainted with a second Johannine epistle, Tertullian not; Clement and Tertullian know the Epistle of Jude, which Irenæus does not know; while the latter again seems to know the Epistle of James, which the former do not know. Clement is acquainted with an Apocalypse of Peter, of which the others know nothing. Even of that which has been uniformly handed down, it is not always certain whether it is apostolic. In Alexandria the Epistle to the Hebrews is looked upon as Pauline, in North Africa as a work of Barnabas; the Epistle of Jude is in the latter place regarded as apostolic, in the former probably not. There is not even unanimity as to who are apostles. Clement reckons James the brother of the Lord, and even the Roman

possible in deciding the question as to what books should belong to the New Testament, to adhere to the exclusive validity of the apostolic writings, as sacred books. For the Gospels had long been sacred in the usage of the Church; and two of them were non-apostolic. It was equally impossible, for practical reasons, to give up the Acts of the Apostles, which were also non-apostolic; and yet other writings, such as the *κῆρυγμα Πέτρον*, where they were known, made similar pretensions. Moreover the point of view under which these primitive records of the history of Christianity had been received among the Holy Scriptures differed entirely from that under which the apostolic records had become sacred writings; while the Apocalypses with their revelations came under a third standpoint.² Hence it was impossible to agree, even if the attempt had been made, as to the point of view in accordance with which the choice of New Testament books

Clement and Barnabas among them; while Tertullian very decidedly distinguishes the latter from the apostles. But these differences are not yet felt; as yet there is no dispute on the subject; each one uses as apostolic what he knows, or thinks he knows to have proceeded from the apostles in his sense of the word, without reflecting that a different opinion prevails elsewhere.

² It is incomprehensible how Ewald could still say that the only test-question on receiving a book into the New Testament was whether it contained the true word of Christ and the Spirit emanating from Him; and the earlier the time the less were the feeling and judgment of the best Christians likely to go astray. For the word and spirit of Christ formed the very point on which the controversy with heresy turned, and it was only for the purpose of settling this definitely that reference had been made back to the primitive documents of apostolic time. Where such a principle would lead, is shown by the untenable opinion of Tertullian respecting the Shepherd of Hermas. Though Credner says that direct or indirect apostolic descent was accepted as the New Testament principle, usage being made the essential principle in each individual case, yet there was no usage where the writings regarded as apostolic were concerned; and the notion of an indirect apostolic descent was simply an expedient for getting over the discrepancy of the use of the Gospels with the standpoint from which the New Testament started. It is Tertullian himself who in an incidental reflection on usage as applied to the Epistle to the Hebrews, asserts the principle of apostolicity as such, in opposition to it.

should be made, since this differed even with respect to those portions of the New Testament which were universally accepted. But there was no reason whatever to discuss the question, since the differences that had necessarily arisen within the range of the New Testament were not yet perceived and therefore formed no stumbling-block. The Church on her side required no collection of writings whence to extract what was pure doctrine, in which case it would have been necessary first of all to come to an agreement as to the sources of pure doctrine. She did not reject heretical compositions on account of their not belonging to such a collection, but because they were opposed to the apostolic doctrine that had been handed down, and which she now tried to set forth as divinely accredited only by her own sacred writings. Whatever from any standpoint could lay claim to belong to these, and answered such end, was welcome; and the consciousness of the possession would not have been disturbed even if it had been known that the possession of others was less rich. Hence it was impossible to form a Canon, *i.e.* to come to a decision as to what writings should exclusively belong to the New Testament: And when the need of such a settlement did arise, the Church was already bound by her own past, and so hindered from forming a decision on any fixed principle. This very time, when the Canon was in process of formation, bequeathed to the time that followed, an inheritance that gave rise to constant doubts, and ultimately made a determination on any fixed principle impossible.³

³ According to this, the view that the New Testament Canon originated simultaneously with the Catholic Church, which has recently become prevalent (comp. *e.gr.* Holtzmann, *Einleitung*), must be distinctly contested. Nor is Harnack's view (comp. his *Lehrb. d. Dogmengesch.*, Freiburg, 1886), that although not yet closed in the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria it was closed in the Romish Church of Asia Minor in the course of the second century, and therefore already appears as a made up quantity in Irenæus and Tertullian, capable of proof. All that he brings forward in favour of this view applies only to the Canon of the Gospels. The presumption with which he sets out, *viz.* that in selecting for it the tradi-

§ 10. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE FORMATION OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT CANON.

1. The constant reading of the New Testament writings at divine service (§ 8, 7), combined with the consciousness that they formed an integral whole as contrasted with the Old Testament (§ 9, 1), naturally gave rise to the need of putting these writings together in manuscripts. Hence originated, and that spontaneously, the necessity of coming to a decision as to which of the current writings should be read in the Church, and thus receive the rank of sacred books on a par with those of the Old Testament. It is certain that we now possess no such manuscripts proceeding from the beginning of the third century; but from the old Syriac translation of the Bible, the so-called Peshito, which was unquestionably arranged for ecclesiastical use, we see what N. T. writings were read in the Syrian Church at that time.¹ These were the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Pauline epistles along with the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of 1 Peter, 1 John, and James. Owing to the fluctuation of their sequence in the manuscripts, we can unfortunately no longer ascertain the original order; it is only certain that the Epistle to the Hebrews was joined to those of Paul (being in the first instance placed at the end, after the

tional reading-books were adhered to, is incorrect, since it can be proved that the ecclesiastical reading of the epistles was a consequence of their elevation to the rank of sacred writings (§ 8, 7). But the view common to both, that some of the transmitted writings, such as the Epistle to the Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, or perhaps even the Apocalypse, were only arranged for the Canon in accordance with the point of view by which it was regulated, is entirely groundless.

¹ The opinion of J. D. Michaelis, that the translation did not originally contain the Epistle to the Hebrews, has been thoroughly refuted by Hug; but the view of the latter, that it originally contained all our present New Testament writings and that those wanting in the manuscripts were first left out in the fourth century, although adopted again by Hilgenfeld, is entirely unfounded, and needs no contradiction. Comp. Wicelhaus. *de Novi Testamenti antiqua quam Peshitho vocant, libri iv.*, Hal., 1850.

epistles to single persons) even where these were preceded by the three epistles emanating from the primitive apostolic circle, or where the Acts come between them and the latter. It cannot surprise us that of the primitive apostolic epistles only 1 Peter and John should appear in the translation, since we found no trace of 2 Peter even among the Church teachers at the end of the second century; and of the two smaller Johannine epistles, a partial knowledge and use of the second only. But it is a noteworthy fact that the Epistle of Jude, which was known to Tertullian as an apostolic writing and was repeatedly used by Clement, is here wanting, while on the contrary the Epistle of James, which was used by none of the Church Fathers, is included. But the absence of the Apocalypse, after all that has already been said of the use and repute of this work, cannot possibly be accounted for on the assumption that it was not regarded as apostolic by the Syrian Church, or was rejected as a book that did not contain genuine revelation. It seems rather to lead to the conclusion that this book was not read at divine service in the Syrian Church; a circumstance which might easily be explained by the difficulty of understanding its visions and prophecies, as well as by the fact that the reading of the apostolic writings along with the Gospels was intended to keep the Church in mind of the *doctrine* of the apostles.

2. Without doubt a Latin translation was also prepared at that time for the Latin-speaking Churches; but although it appears that the old translator of Irenæus and Tertullian used such a one in common with others, yet it is obviously impossible to determine its extent or even its order. Instead of it we have a most remarkable document emanating from the Latin Church, presenting the first attempt with which we are acquainted towards a definite determination of the books that should have public recognition in the Church, and in so far the first actual attempt to form a Canon in the Church.

It is the so-called Muratorian Fragment. Its origin and date are indeed very uncertain; but the examination of itself proves clearly enough that it belongs to the time when the Canon was in process of formation, and proceeds from the Latin Church.

The Fragment was first published by Lud. Ant. Muratori (*Antiquitates Italicæ med. ævi*, 1740, iii., pp. 851 ff.), from a parchment MS. of the Ambrosian Library in Milan, found in the Bobbio Monastery, and belonging at the latest to the ninth century, afterwards repeatedly collated and edited (comp. S. P. Tregelles, *Canon. Murat.*, ed. Oxford, 1867, and Harnack in Brieger's *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.*, iii., 1879, pp. 595 ff.). The beginning is missing, and the Latin is in many places so very obscure that it gives rise to the most varied interpretations. Whether it is an awkward translation from the Greek, as Hug, Tregelles, Mangold and especially Hilgenfeld maintain, although the play on words in *fel cum melle* makes this very improbable, or whether it is only the *lingua vulgata* distorted by Scottish-English pronunciation and the orthography of the ninth century, as it was spoken in Africa, as Credner seeks to prove, or whether the obscurities are mainly due to corruptions of the Text and may be cleared up by conjecture, is still matter of dispute. The view of the first editor, that the document proceeded from the Roman presbyter Caius, has been supported only by Volkmar. The date is generally drawn from the statement contained in the fragment, that the Shepherd of Hermas was written "nuperrime nostris temporibus sedente cathedra urbis Romæ ecclesiæ Pio episcopo fratre ejus," and is mostly put at the last quarter of the second century, since Pius was bishop down to the second half of the fiftieth year (Wieseler, 170; Credner, Harnack, 170-90; Volkmar, after 190; immediately before or contemporaneous with Irenæus: Hesse, Hilgenfeld). But we must not overlook the fact that this determination of time, taking the context into consideration, was only meant to show the wide interval between the Shepherd and the apostolic time; and since Irenæus could say that the Apocalypse, which according to him was composed under Domitian, was seen *ὁ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς* (*adv. Hær.*, V. 30, 3), there is no reason why we should not with Hug come down to the beginning of the third century. It is also matter of dispute as to whether the Fragment proceeded from the Romish Church, or from North Africa as seems to be indicated by the language, as well as by many points of contact with the views of Tertullian; so too, in what connection the author was led to discuss the New Testament books, and what was his object. Compare on the Fragment, R. Wieseler, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1847, 4; v. Gilse, *disputatio de antiquissimo libr. sacr. nov. fœd. catalogo*, Amst. 1852; Laurent, *Neutestamentl. Studien*, Gotha, 1886; Hesse, *das*

Muratorische Fragment, Giessen, 1873; Harnack, *ibid.*, 1879, pp. 358 ff.; Overbeck, *zur Gesch. des Kanons*, Chemnitz, 1880.

It is beyond doubt that the author acknowledges the four Gospels and supplies further information respecting their origin, although the section on Luke and John alone is fully preserved. He expressly points out that in spite of their differences, especially at the beginning, they attest all the facts in the life of Jesus in the same spirit, as well as His second coming in glory.¹ He joins the *Acta Apostolorum* written by Luke directly with the Gospels, and then passes on to the Epistles of Paul. He looks on the Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans as the most important, giving a short description of their contents, because they are the most copious. He then sets forth how Paul, after the example of John who in the Apocalypse, in the seven specially named Churches, addressed himself to the whole Church, makes the seven Churches to which he wrote (in the following order, Cor., Eph., Phil., Col., Gal., Thess., Rom., and repeatedly to two of them) representative of the whole Church. Hence he feels it necessary to explain with what right the letters written to individual Churches may now be regarded as the common possession of the Church. The necessity is even stronger where the four epistles written by Paul *pro affectu et dilectione* to single individuals, are concerned, and which are nevertheless in *honore ecclesie catholice*, because they are normative for *ecclesiastica disciplina*, and are thus *sanctificatae*.² Throughout the whole of this larger division, the

¹ It is an obvious error to suppose that he seeks to establish or even to defend the genuineness of the fourth Gospel from the Johannine epistle, as is frequently asserted (comp. Mangold), since on the contrary at the beginning of the epistle he explains the many reminiscences of the Gospel on the supposition of a reference to it. But the notices respecting its origin have as little tendency in this direction as those on Luke's Gospel.

² The words certainly do not imply that their reception was opposed or their Pauline origin doubted; nor can I agree with Harnack in his

question of recognition does not come in at all, being taken for granted where the Gospels, the Acts, and the Pauline Epistles are concerned. Only at the end are some spurious Pauline Epistles excluded, as to whose exclusion, however, there can be no question in the Church, because they are heretical compositions.³

3. The Epistle to the Hebrews is entirely wanting among the writings proceeding from the primitive apostolic circle, because, as with Irenæus and Tertullian, it does not come under consideration as apostolic, which is the case also with the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas. From this it appears that the principle of apostolicity holds good, at least where the epistles are concerned. Therefore the Epistle to Jude which, along with the two Johannine Epistles already mentioned with the Gospel, unquestionably appears as valid in the Church, was certainly regarded as apostolic, as it is by Tertullian. In any case these epistles (*epistola sane Judæ et superscriptio Johannis duas in catholica habentur*) seem to have been considered rather as an appendix to the apostolic collection of epistles, because the proper task of the primitive apostles appeared to be to hand down the acts and words of Jesus in the Gospels; for which reason the fourth Gospel is expressly prefaced by the remark that it is not strange *si Johannes singula etiam in epistulis suis proferat* (No.

assumption that a new principle of ecclesiastical validity was here laid down. It is generally overlooked that the Epistle to Philemon is placed in the same category with the so-called Pastoral Epistles. Hence the only thing to be explained is how letters manifestly private could attain to the rank of sacred books in the Church.

³ There is an Ep. ad Laodicenses and one ad Alexandrinos, *Pauli nomine fictæ ad hæresem Marcionis et alia plura, quæ in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest, because fel cum melle non congruit*. The Laodicean Epistle was plainly a fiction on the basis of Col. iv. 16 f., perhaps only the Ephesian Epistle, mutilated by Marcion and called the Laodicean Epistle, is meant; that the Alexandrian Epistle should refer to the Epistle to the Hebrews is quite impossible, since the latter neither bears the name of Paul, nor could any one regard it as Marcionitic, nor can it have been addressed to Alexandria. Comp. § 31, 5.

2, note 1); and here in the certainly mis-written *superscriptio* we have at all events some kind of reference to it.¹ Probably this also explains the enigmatical silence with regard to the first Epistle of Peter. For it is quite possible that it was mentioned in the section on Mark's Gospel, which is unfortunately wanting, and which like the rest must be traced back to communications made by Peter. If so, it cannot fail to have been observed that so many of Christ's sayings are repeated in this epistle as passages from the history of His passion.² And it is only on the assumption of a fuller treatment of it and its relation to the Gospel in this missing section that we can account for its being passed over here; while the indefinite *epistulæ suæ*, to which reference was made in John's Gospel, is here expressly termed a

¹ Perhaps the still unexplained *et (probably ut) sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta*, which, if taken as a recognition of an Old Testament Scripture, or even as analogous to the circumstance that the Epistles of John, though bearing no name, were written by friends in his honour, still remains unintelligible in this connection, may be most easily explained on the supposition that the primitive apostles are spoken of as the friends of Christ the second Solomon, and that besides their record of his sayings, they also wrote these epistles in honour of Him. But it cannot therefore be said that these epistles were of doubtful genuineness, or that they formed only a second class with respect to canonicity. That which *habetur in ecclesia, is receptum and sanctificatum* without question.

² Perhaps the remaining portion that has been preserved of this section: *quibus tamen interfuit, et ita posuit*, does not refer to Mark as is generally supposed, though his Gospel is never in tradition represented as the testimony of an eye-witness, and its appendix, even if already known to the author of the Fragment, is too unimportant to be separately described, but as Laurent already guessed, though without perceiving the right application, to Peter, who in 1 Peter v. 1 calls himself *μάργης τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων*, and in fact in i. 18 f.; ii. 21-24, describes His death-sufferings with vivid clearness, and speaks of His resurrection, i. 3, as one who had himself lived to see it (comp. i. 21). That the way in which a mention of it and even a mention of both Petrine Epistles, is by conjecture put into the Fragment, is mere arbitrary interpretation, may now be regarded as admitted; and that it was excluded on account of its being addressed to individual Churches, as Harnack maintains, I hold to be quite impossible.

*duas Johannis.*³ It is certain that in addition to the Apocalypse of John, that of Peter, already mentioned in the Pauline epistles, and known likewise to Clement as we have seen, was also received. If it be objected that some did not approve of its being read in the Church, we may account for this on the same ground on which the Syriac Church-bible refused to accept the Apocalypse of John (No. 1).⁴ The *tantum* in the statement respecting the apocalypses is expressly directed against the Apocalypse of Hermas, which as we have seen, was used by Irenæus and Clement, and rejected even by Tertullian on merely subjective grounds, when its contents did not suit his purpose.⁵ The author distinctly asserts the principle that even apocalyptic writings can only lay claim to the character of official ecclesiastical writings when they proceed from apostles, quite apart from the value of their contents, that is to say, the

³ From this it is clear that we cannot here assume a reference to the second and third Epistle, and make the plural *Epistulae* refer only to the first, as Credner, Hesse and Hilgenfeld do. The third Epistle, of which as yet we have found no notice, was in any case little adapted for reception into the Church-bible, since it had nothing to recommend it, as the Pauline private letters had.

⁴ There is something so striking in the fact that in the words "apocalypse etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt," doubtless to some extent corrupted, the *quam* is made to refer only to the latter, that it is possible this *legi nolunt* originally referred to both apocalypses. But it is quite an error to suppose that one or both were by this means made valid only in a secondary degree.

⁵ This rejection is certainly not shared by our author, since he expressly says, "legi eum (pastorem) quidem oportet," which of course did not refer to the reading at public service, whence it would have received unquestioned official ecclesiastical validity, but to private reading. But the book is not only permitted to be read; the author manifestly belongs to those of whom Eusebius says, ὅφ' ἐτέρων δὲ ἀναγκαϊότατον οἷς μάλιστα δεῖ στοιχειώσεως εἰσαγωγικῆς κέκριται (H. E., iii. 3). On the contrary the reference is to those among whom, as Eusebius adds, it was ἐν ἐκκλησίαις δεδημοσιευμένον, when he expressly states that it dare not "se publicare in ecclesia in finem temporum," because it neither belongs to the concluded number of the (Old Testament) prophets, nor *inter apostolos*, since it is quite a modern book (comp. No. 2).

principle expressly applied to the epistolary books by Tertullian, and virtually adhered to by the Fragment in question, is also extended to the ecclesiastical validity of the apocalyptic books; while this principle could no longer be carried out where the historical books were concerned. It was probably the Montanistic movement which led to the exercise of caution in this respect. At least we find it expressly stated in the conclusion that nothing whatever is accepted by the Gnostics and Montanists.⁶

4. It cannot be proved that there was any essential change in the West during the third century with respect to the recognition of the New Testament writings. It is indeed the prevailing view that the Roman Presbyter Caius rejected the Apocalypse of John and declared it to be the work of Cerinthus; but the passage cited by Eusebius (*H. E.*, 13, 28) does not by any means say so. It only says that Cerinthus δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων τερατολογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδιδαγμέναι invented lying stories, and then adduces carnal conceptions respecting the 1000 years' reign, which are entirely foreign to the Apocalypse, and which he expressly ascribes to it as an ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχων ταῖς γραφαῖς τ. θεοῦ.¹ Hippolytus seems

⁶ The persons and writings here mentioned contain respectively much that is obscure. Harnack has most ingeniously endeavoured to prove that the Diatessaron of Tatian (§ 7, 6) is also rejected here (comp. *Zeitschr. für luth. Theol. und Kirche*, 1874, pp. 276, ff., pp. 445, etc., 1875, pp. 201, ff.). Should this suspicion be verified, it would only lead to the conclusion that Tatian had in the meantime acquired the reputation of a heretic. But the whole undertaking, to assign official validity to a Gospel-harmony in place of or along with the four ecclesiastical Gospels, must have appeared suspicious to the West, accustomed to more rigid ecclesiastical forms.

¹ The question here is not indeed of revelations which Cerinthus pretended to have received as one of the great apostles, as Baur and Volkmar maintained, nor of the Apocalypse of Peter, as Credner thought, but the revelations alleged to have been written by a great apostle are undoubtedly those contained in the Apocalypse of John, which Cerinthus misinterpreted for the very reason that the sacred Scriptures (in their true sense) were hateful to him. He does not say that ecclesiastical

even to have written a book *de Apocalypsi* (Hieron., *de Vir. Ill.*, 61), and quotes it in his work *de Antichristo* as a writing of the Apostle John, as do Cyprian (*Ep.* 63) and Laetantius (*Epit.*, 42). The Epistle to the Hebrews is declared to be non-Pauline by Hippolytus, as well as Irenæus (Phot., *Bibl. Cod.*, 121, 232); and Caius of Rome excludes it from the number of Pauline epistles, of which he counts only thirteen (Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 10). Even the Novatian party, which refused to receive the *lapsi* back again, made no use of the passages Heb. vi. 4, x. 26, so favourable to its views. Cyprian, like the Muratorian Canon, enumerates seven Churches to which Paul (*adv. Jud.*, 1, 20; *de Exhort. Mart.*, 11), like the Apocalypticist, wrote; so likewise did Victorin at the end of the century. Up to this time therefore the West knew nothing of a Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and therefore did not include it in its New Testament. So too of the epistles proceeding from the primitive apostolic circle, Cyprian cites only 1 Peter (*Ep.* 58) and 1 John (*Ep.* 28, 69); yet at the Council of Carthage, in his time, 256, a certain Bishop Aurelius appeals to 2 John 10., with the formula *Johannes in Epistola sua*.

5. *Origen* expressly states that the *θεῖαι γραφαί* of the Old and New Testament are the true sources by which Christian doctrine may be proved, inasmuch as the sacred books are not *συγγράμματα* of men, but were written *ἐξ ἐπινοίας τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* (*de Princ.*, 4, 1, 9).¹ We have here a clear indica-

authorities, as for example Caius, supposed Dionysius of Alexandria (ap. Euseb., 7, 25) to be among those who rejected the Apocalypse as a work of Cerinthus, and it is quite improbable. Even Eusebius can hardly have so understood him, or he would certainly have mentioned this in his disquisitions on the Johannine Apocalypse; assuredly Theodoret did not (*Fab. Hær.*, 2, 3), since he ascribes these pretended *ἀποκαλύψεις* to Cerinthus himself.

¹ Origen too is still unacquainted with the old division of the *γραφή*, or *ἐνδιάθηκοι* (in the *Dialog. de recta fide*, sect. 5, called also *ἐνδιάθηκοι βιβλοὶ* (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25) into the law and the prophets, the apostolic writings and the Gospels (*Hom. in Gen.* xvi., *in Jer.* xix. 3).

tion of the point of view under which these books afterwards received the designation of the Canon; but whether he himself already so termed them is very doubtful. In his view the τῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὴν διαδοχὴν ἀποστόλων οὐρανοῦ ἐκκλησίας (*de Princ.*, 4, 9) is the sum of apostolic doctrine, just as at the end of the second century, while the apostolicæ traditiones are the ecclesiastica regula; but these are in his opinion already contained essentially in the libri ecclesiastici (comp. *de Princ.*, præf. 8), for which reason the *exire de regula fidei* is to him virtually synonymous with the hearing of sermons, *qui sunt extra scripturam* (*Ser.* 46 in *Matt.*).² Hence it is absolutely necessary to know accurately what writings belong to the *Scriptura*, and Origen is the first who (*ibid.*) lays down a fixed principle in this matter, viz. that the *prima et ecclesiastica traditio* must decide, and therefore that only those *scripturæ* belong to it *in quibus omnis Christianus consentit et credit*, the ἐν πάσαις ἐκκλησίαις πεπιστευμένοι εἶναι θεῖαι (*in John* i. 4, comp. *Cels.* 3, 45, *de Princ.*,

although naturally there is here no question of a collection under the name ὁ ἀπόστολος, otherwise the O. T. writings would have to be termed ὁ προφήτης to the exclusion of the νόμος (comp. § 9, 1, note 3).

² Hilgenfeld indeed still maintains that Origen already used the expression κανῶν and κανονικά of the biblical books. But since they do not appear in his Greek works that have come down to us, and the use of them cannot be proved for quite a century later, not even in Eusebius, it remains more than probable that the translator first put the expression Canon, *Scripturæ canonicae*, *libri canonizati* into his works. It is remarkable indeed that the expression *liber regularis* also appears in *Matth.*, *Ser.* 117; and it is not impossible that with him κανῶν already meant ecclesiastical tradition, so far as it was normative to determine what writings were sacred (comp. *Hom. in Josh.* ii. 1), and κανονικά those books which were valid in the Church in accordance with this rule (comp. § 11, 5). In no case is it conceivable that the use of this expression by him or any other points to a fixed normal number constituting the *καινὴ διαθήκη*, as Mangold supposes. If we take into account all that can be proved respecting the position of Origen with regard to the New Testament, we cannot doubt that at his time there was not yet any question of such limitation, and for this very reason he cannot have used the term κανῶν in the later sense, in which it denotes a concluded collection.

4, 1), the *ὁμολογούμενα ἀναντίρρητα*. Hence arises the antithesis of the *κοινὰ καὶ δεδημοσιευμένα βιβλία* and the *ἀπόκρυφα* (in *Matth.*, tom. 10, 18, comp. *Ser.* 46 in *Matth.*: “secretæ et non vulgatæ, in quibus aut pauci sunt credentes aut nullus”). The latter term does not therefore necessarily imply something to be rejected or that was heretical, but is only employed by way of antithesis to that official recognition of the collective Church which makes a writing universally known; whereas that which does not gain this recognition remains in a narrower circle and is therefore hidden.³ Origen expressly counsels the rejection of everything apocryphal, on the basis of 1 Thess. v. 21; but for the sake of those who are not able to distinguish the true from the false, he goes on to say, “nemo uti debet ad confirmationem dogmatum libris, qui sunt extra canonistas scripturas (*Ser.* 28 in *Matth.*). It is therefore clear that Origen already

³ In Mark iv. 22 the *ἀπόκρυφον* is already placed in antithesis to the *ἔλθειν εἰς φανερόν*, which according to Matt. x. 26 f., takes place when that which is spoken in the narrowest circle is made public. Already in Clem., *Hom.*, 3, 38, we find an allusion to the *παρὰ Ἰουδαίους δημόσια βιβλία* (comp. Valent. apud Clem., *Strom.* 6, 6). Clement of Alexandria uses the expression of a work of the heretics, from which they derive a *δόγμα* (*Strom.* 3, 4, *ἐββύη αὐτοῖς τὸ δόγμα ἐκ τίνος ἀποκρύφου*), without necessarily implying anything more than that this work was neither known nor recognised in the Church. Even though Tertullian gets angry against the *apocryphus pastor mæchorum* (*de Pudic.*, 20), yet chap. 10 (*inter Apocrypha et falsa*) shows that the term does not itself imply a judgment respecting the contents of the book, but only an antithesis to the *receptum*. The same thing holds good of the *πλήθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νύθων γραφῶν & ἐπλάσαν* (scil. d. *Häretiker*) in Iren. I. 20, 1. Where Origen is concerned, however, it must be specially borne in mind that to him the difference was of great importance for the Old Testament. He says in the *præfat. in Cant.*, that certain writings have become *ἀπόκρυφα*, owing to the fact that the Holy Spirit *abstulit* them *medio*, because they contained something that transcended human power of comprehension. According to others there is “*multa in eis corrupta et contra fidem veram.*” The apostles and evangelists were able to make use of them (comp. also in *Matth.*, tom. 10, 18) because they knew by the Holy Ghost, what part of them to receive and what to reject; but for us, who have not the same fulness of the Spirit, the rule holds good: “non transeundi sunt termini, quos statuerunt patres nostri.”

perceived that it was impossible to lay down a material principle for the determination of the normative Scriptures, and therefore adheres to the formal one of universal recognition. But even that required a double limitation. Much that could not come under this category was of great inherent value; and since its recognition could not be demanded, one who was conscious of the power to discriminate between true and false, might use it himself as a means of confirming the truth, leaving the question of its recognition out of consideration. It is of more importance to note that whatever Origen regards as apostolic he employs *ad confirmationem dogmatum*, without any reserve, even where ecclesiastical tradition and universal recognition are by no means on his side. This points clearly to the fact that originally the apostolic as such was regarded as normative. But since in reality the principle of apostolicity could not be carried out where the Gospels and Acts were concerned, the principle of tradition alone was available for the formation of a Canon, and this had to be broken through wherever the apostolic had gradually come into use at a later time.

6. Even in Origen's view, the four *Gospels* are, as a matter of course, *μόνα ἀναντίρρητα ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ* (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25). "Quattuor tantum evangelia sunt probata, e quibus sub persona domini proferenda sunt dogmata," from which it appears that the words of the Lord were the true canonical element in the Gospels. "Nihil aliud probamus nisi quod ecclesia quattuor tantum evangelia recipienda" (*Hom. 1 in Luke*). The Gospel of the Hebrews was entirely outside this Canon of the Gospels; but wherever Origen finds a word that suits him he does not hesitate to quote it with the necessary reservation (No. 5), in support of his principle.¹ Even from a book such as the *ἐπιγεγραμμένον*

¹ Compare in *Joh.*, tom. 2, 6: *ἐὰν δὲ προσίεραι τις*; in *Jerem.*, hom. 15, 4: *εἰ δὲ τις παραδέχεται*; in *Matt.*, tom. 15, 14: "si tamen placuit alicui suscipere illud non ad auctoritatem, sed ad manifestationem

κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγέλιον or the βίβλος Ἰακώβου (i.e. the apocryphal Protevangel of James), he has adopted the idea that the so-called brothers of Jesus were sons of Joseph by a former marriage (comp. on John ii. 12, Matth., tom. x. 17, and with it § 36, 3), without by so doing expressing an opinion on the value of these writings in other respects. With the Gospel of Luke he associated the πράξεις of the same author (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25). On the other hand, speaking of the κήρυγμα Πέτρον which Clement likewise uses (§ 9, 3, note 2), he says that it is not retained *inter libros ecclesiasticos*; and that it was written neither by Peter nor any other inspired man (*de Princ.*, præf. 8).² Origen has quoted all the thirteen

propositæ quæstionis." The saying of Christ quoted in *de Orat.* 14 from the treatise *contr. Cels.*, 7, 44, can hardly be taken from the Gospel to the Hebrews, but is the traditional remodelling of Matt. vi. 33, with which he is familiar from Clem., *Strom.* 1, 24 (comp. § 7, 6, note 2) and the saying about the *τραπέζιται* (in *Joh.*, tom. 19, 2) he also gets from Clement (*Strom.* 1, 28). That he made use of the Gospel according to the Egyptians, as Credner maintains, can by no means be proved, since in Hom. 1 on Luke he expressly names it among heretical works such as the Gospel *juxta duodecim Apostolos*, the Gospel of Basilides, and, though less decidedly, the Gospel according to Thomas and according to Matthew. When Sabellius used it (Epiph., *Her.*, 62, 2), he belonged to those who did not know how to separate the true and the false in what was extra-canonical (No. 5). In tom. 20, 12, on John, he even ventures to adopt a saying of the Lord (*παραδέχσθαι*), from the Acta Pauli, just as a saying of Paul's there preserved, *recte dictus videtur* to him, *de Princ.*, I. 2, 3, although he immediately contrasts with it a saying of John as *excelsius et præclarus*.

² Although this writing is here in the translation called *doctrina Petri*, it is unquestionably the same of which he speaks in tom. 13, 17, on John, and of which he there expressly says that it still remains to be investigated whether it is γνήσιον or νόθον or μκτόν. This of course cannot refer to genuineness in respect of origin, since he distinctly denies its apostolic descent, and since à μκτόν would here be inconceivable, but only in respect of its contents, which, as was the case with so many apocryphal works (No. 5), were not to be rejected because they unwisely professed to be genuine apostolic doctrines (νόθον). Hence it has been erroneously concluded (comp. L. Schulze and Holtzmann) that Origen adopts three classes into which the writings that have come down to us are to be divided. Origen knows only two classes (No. 5), but is fully aware that the writings not received by the Church differ very much in value.

Pauline epistles by name, although he never counts them up. The Epistle to the Hebrews was also handed down to him as Pauline by the ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες (Pantænus and Clement), nor were Churches wanting that used it as Pauline, though only in isolated cases. He himself regarded it as only indirectly Pauline, inasmuch as in it a pupil put the νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου into words (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25). But in this indirect sense it was still Pauline for him; and hence he frequently cites it as Pauline without hesitation, although he undoubtedly knew that it was not received in all the Churches, and was therefore not δεδημοσιευμένον. But so far as it was held to be Pauline, this circumstance did not, according to his principle, interfere with its authoritative use (No. 5); when, however, the epistle was not accepted as Pauline, he was obliged to renounce its recognition.³

7. Origen clearly carried out his principles with regard to the Epistles of *Peter*. Peter, he says, μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλείπειν· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέρα· ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25). This doubt certainly does not apply to its genuineness in our sense of the word but to its recognition as a Homologumenon, which might justly be disputed. In point of fact we have neither heard anything of this second epistle, nor found it anywhere cited. For the first time his contemporary Firmilian of Cæsarea

³ Comp. *Ser. 26 in Matt.*: “pone aliquem abdicare epistolam ad Hebr. quasi non Pauli—tamen si quis suscipit ad Hebr. quasi ep. Pauli.” It is quite an error to suppose, as Credner does, that Origen, where the Epistle to the Hebrews was concerned, laid down the completely subjective principle that the test by which to determine what belonged to the New Testament was its worthiness of an apostle in contents and thoughts. By accepting an indirect Pauline origin he only wished to reconcile the verdict of his teachers and his own high opinion of the epistle on the one hand, with his critical conclusion that it could not have been written by Paul on the other hand. But in making this indirect apostolic origin suffice to establish its authority, he only did what the Church had done long before where the writings of Mark and Luke were concerned, which had also been written by apostolic disciples, their contents having emanated from the apostles.

says in his *Epist. ad Cyprian*, that Peter and Paul "in epistolis suis hæreticos execrati sunt et ut eos evitemus monuerunt" (*Epist. Cypri.*, 75), which can only apply to our second epistle. But Origen had no doubt as to its Petrine origin, and therefore unreservedly classed it as *scriptura* (*in Num.*, hom. 13, 8; *in Exod.*, hom. 12, 4).¹ Of *John* he says: καταλέλοιπε καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πάνυ ὀλίγων στίχων, ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην ἑπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶν γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25). It is strange that he places the second and third so completely on a par, although in respect of ecclesiastical usage they are so distinct; and to me the οὐ πάντες seems to contain a tacit admission that he himself does not regard them as apostolic. He has made no use of them, while he repeatedly cites the first. Where Origen speaks of the Lord's brethren, he says: Ἰούδας ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὴν ὀλιγόστιχον μὲν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανόυ χάριτος ἐρρώμένων λόγων (*in Matt.*, tom. 10, 17); but, although he often cites the epistle (comp. tom. 13, 27) also as *scriptura divina* (*Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.*, 3, 6), yet occasionally he withdraws his recognition (*in Matt.*, tom. 17, 30): εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰούδα πρόσσιτό τις ἐπιστολήν), and therefore certainly does not regard it as apostolic in a strict sense. Although it is striking that in the passage respecting the brothers of the Lord, where he speaks of *James* at considerable length, he makes no mention of his epistle, which we found in the Syrian Church-bible, yet he has frequently cited it (*in Joh.*, tom. 19, 6: ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ τοῦ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν). But neither does he regard this epistle as apostolic in a strict sense, since he attributes its author-

¹ In his view it was a Homologumenon (No. 5) because an apostolic writing, and even though not yet universally known, had undoubtedly a claim as such to belong to the New Testament. Hence he constantly used it without reservation (*in Ep. ad Rom.*, 8, 4; *in Levi.*, hom. 4), since the suspicion that all his citations of it were first introduced by Rufinus, is quite baseless, and on account of their frequent interweaving with others, utterly untenable.

ship to the brother of the Lord (*Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.*, 4, 8); for which reason he sometimes abandons the use of it also, and refers to those who *παραδέχονται* Jas. ii. 20 (*in John*, 20, 10).² On the other hand he certainly speaks no longer of the Roman Clement as an apostle, even in the wider sense; he calls him a disciple of the apostles (*de Princ.*, II. 3, 6), identifies him with the Clement of Phil. iv. 3 (*in Joh. tom.* 6, 36), and regards him as the author of the *περίοδοι* (*in Gen.* ii. 14). What he quotes from him (comp. *ibid.* on Ezekiel viii. 3) has to do partly with matters of fact alone, partly with a philosophical view that has no connection with matters of doctrine. The Epistle of Barnabas he mentions only as a source employed by Celsus (*Contr. Cels.*, 1, 63), and with the formula: "eadem prope Barnabas in epistola sua docet" (*de Princ.*, III. 2, 4), which does not put it on a level with the inspired Scriptures. The *Apocalypse* is in Origen's view naturally a work of the apostle John (*in Joh.*, tom. 1, 14); of Peter's *Apocalypse* we hear no more. On the other hand he looked upon the *Shepherd of Hermas* not only as a very useful work, but also "ut puto divinitus

² The *φερομένη* (*in Joh.*, tom. 19, 6) expresses no doubt as to genuineness, but would certainly not have been used if the epistle had belonged to the Homologumena, since it only designates it as one of those found in circulation. In the Latin portion of his works that have been handed down, James and Jude are often enough termed *apostoli*, but this is not confirmed by any passage in the Greek; and though Origen himself makes use of the expression, it is without doubt only in the wider sense of his teacher Clement (§ 9, 5). It is quite an error to suppose that he mistakenly puts the brothers of the Lord among the twelve apostles. Hence even the passage where both are reckoned among the apostles who with their trumpets overthrew all the bulwarks of philosophy (*in libr. Jos.*, hom. 7, 1), may be original; and when in a flight of rhetoric he counts James and John with those who have digged the *puteos Novi Testamenti* (*in Gen.*, hom. 13, 4), this is certainly incorrect speaking if we take his principles (No. 5) into account, but not on the whole inconceivable owing to his frequent use of the epistles of both, especially if the suspicion that Rufinus altered both passages, which has frequently been expressed, be not excluded, since the *divina ap. Apost. Jas. Epist.* (hom. 13 *in Psalm xxxvi.*) probably proceeds from him.

inspirata" (*Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.*, 10, 31), for which reason he often cites it as γραφή (*Philoc.*, 8). But in *Matt.* tom. 14, 21, he admits that although certainly handed down in the Church, it is οὐ παρὰ πάντων ὁμολογουμένη εἶναι θεία, and on one occasion even speaks of it as ὑπό τινων καταφρονούμενον (*de Princ.*, 4, 11). Hence he frequently quotes it with the familiar clause: "si cui tamen scriptura illa recipienda videtur (*in Num.*, hom. 8), si cui placet etiam illam legere" (ser. 53 in *Matt.*).

Whenever we attempt to carry out the principles (No. 5) laid down by Origen, we are led to the conclusion that his standpoint is essentially based on an illusion. Because a material principle can no longer be applied to the determination of the writings belonging to the New Testament, he adheres to usage alone, and makes this, as the unanimous tradition of the Church, the regulating principle. But there was no unanimous usage of the Church, nor could there be such, for the same reason which led him to give up the idea of the establishment of a Canon on a fixed principle. The double limitation with which he carried out the principle of tradition, was in truth an admission that it was impossible to carry it out. Nevertheless owing to the powerful influence which he exercised as a Church teacher, he, more than any other, contributed to the actual formation of a usage more or less fixed, his presumption of such usage being more and more generally adopted. This was due in great measure to the way in which he considered himself entitled to accept that which was apostolic even where he was not supported by unanimity of usage. Where he hesitated to accept, as in the case of the Gospel according to the Hebrews or of the Apocalypse of Hermas, it was taken as a sign that these writings had not usage on their side; where, as in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews, his non-acceptance was due to the fact that all did not regard it as apostolic, his authority sufficed to establish its reputation as Pauline. So too his authority covered 2nd Peter, 2nd and 3rd John, while it became customary to put even the Epistles of Jude and James in the New Testament, because he manifestly did so, although in their case he now and then accommodated himself to his principle. But so far as his authority reached, the κήρυγμα Πέτρου and the Acta Pauli, the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas, and the Apocalypse of Peter forfeited their claim to belong to the New Testament for ever, by the position which he took up with regard to them.

§ 11. THE CLOSE OF THE CANON IN THE EAST.

1. The influence of Origen is nowhere more powerfully shown than in the fact that it must have become usual soon after his time not only to receive the Epistles of Peter and John, Jude and James in their entirety, but also to regard them as a closed collection as contrasted with that of the Pauline epistles. This is proved beyond a doubt from the way in which Eusebius already speaks of *ἐπὶ τὰ λεγόμενα καθολικαὶ (ἐπιστολαί)*, and calls the Epistle of James *ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν* (*H. E.*, 2, 23, comp. 6, 14). In his day, therefore, the number, name, and even the order of these seven epistles had already become fixed; the Epistle of James, which had first been introduced to wider circles by Origen, being put first, from which it follows that its authorship was at that time ascribed to the brother of the Lord who stood at the head of the Church in Jerusalem, and had in this way acquired a sort of primacy over the apostles themselves. Whether he and Jude were already identified as belonging to the Twelve, or only counted apostles in the wider sense, we do not know. But the designation of these epistles as Catholic can mean nothing less than that they were from the beginning addressed more or less to the whole Church, in contrast with the Pauline epistles, which were intended for separate Churches.

It is evident that the addresses of James, Jude, 1 John and Peter may be taken in this sense; but that of 1 Peter too was of so comprehensive a character that it contrasted similarly with Paul's epistles addressed to individual Churches. The *ἐκλεκτῆ κυρία* of 2 John 1 was doubtless formerly interpreted of the Church, and the sole exception of 3 John was of no account, after it had once become customary to put together the non-Pauline epistles as such. It is easy to understand why they were classed together under this distinctive appellation, if we remember how a special authorization was required in order to give the Pauline epistles a meaning for the whole Church (§ 10, 2), such as these

epistles already possessed by virtue (at least apparently) of their address.¹ That the expression *καθολικός* does indicate this more comprehensive design of the epistles appears from Clement, who characterizes the letter of Acts xv. 23 as *ἐπιστολή καθολική τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀπάντων* (*Strom.* 4, 15); from Origen, who repeatedly refers to 1 Peter and 1 John, and even to the Epistle of Jude (*Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.*, 5, 1) and Barnabas (*Contr. Cels.*, 1, 63) as *ἐπιστ. καθολική*; as also from Dionysius of Alexandria, who frequently applies this term to 1 John (ap. Euseb., 7, 25).² The Greek Church, moreover, still adheres to this meaning of the expression, for Œcumenius of Tricca explains it by *ἐγκύκλιοι*; only in the West has the original meaning been lost, and the term been made to apply to what is valid in the Catholic Church, so that Cassiodorus unhesitatingly substitutes the expression *Epistolæ Canonicae*. That later Introductions still contend whether it denotes canonical validity, assured apostolic origin, emanation from various authors (αὐτοὶ καθόλου besides the Pauline), or point to the fact that it was designed for Jews and Gentile Christians or for the promotion of orthodox doctrine, is a manifest error. Comp. Lücke, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, 3.

This growing usage seems to have speedily passed over even to the West, at least the Latin Stichometrie, which is

¹ It is mere prejudice that has led de Wette, Reuss and others to ascribe to them a certain similarity in a theological, literary, and historical aspect, since in all these respects they present as much variety as is conceivable, taking into account their common descent from the primitive apostolic circle. Such a view has only resulted in the unreasonable mistrust with which they are regarded in modern criticism (comp. Holtzmann, Harnack, etc.).

² When Apollonius (Eus., 5, 18) says that the Montanist Themison wrote an *ἐπιστ. καθολική*, the expression can hardly be explained in any other way. But the language of Eusebius himself would prove nothing since he did not invent the term but found it ready to his hand; he too seems to apply the expression *ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαὶ* to the seven Church-letters of Dionysius of Corinth, several of which were indeed addressed to whole circles of Churches, because they belong to the entire sphere of his ecclesiastical activity, in distinction from the last-named private letter to the Chrysophora (*H. E.*, 4, 23); and the passage 3, 3, where, speaking of the pseudonymous writings of Peter (the Acta, the Gospel, the *κῆρυγμα* and the *ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου*) he says they are οὐδ' ὅπως ἐν καθολικοῖς παραδεδομένα, is certainly no rule for the designation of the Catholic epistles, whether we understand the expression as referring to those writings received by the Church (comp. the *καθολικαὶ πράξεις* in Chrys., hom. 10 in 2 *Tim.*), or, as is more probable from the derivation, as referring to the men belonging to it.

found at the end of the Codex Claromontanus of Paul's epistles, and is supposed to belong to the third century, already contains all the seven epistles in question after the Gospels and Pauline epistles; the Petrine epistles moreover being placed before that of James, while only 1 Peter and 1 John are to be found in it until after the middle of the century. The *Epistola Barnabæ*, placed between them and the Apocalypse of John, is unquestionably the Epistle to the Hebrews, which here, as in Tertullian, is only known as the Epistle of Barnabas, but was nevertheless received into the *Scripturæ*, contrary to the former usage of the West. The author of the list is indeed still more liberal, since the *Acta Apostolorum*, which come after the Apocalypse, are again followed by the Pastor, the *Acta Pauli* and the *Revelatio Petri*. In the East the authority of Origen was manifestly decisive for the reception of the Epistle to the Hebrews among those of Paul, since from his time onwards it was used as Pauline without any reservation (comp. Bleek, *der Brief an die Hebræer*, Berlin, 1828; 1, § 32 ff.). While the way was thus paved for uniformity of ecclesiastical usage in all other respects, an unexpected difficulty arose. The Apocalypse of John was from the beginning an undoubted part of the New Testament; and that its omission from the Syrian Church-bible (§ 10, 1) proves nothing to the contrary, is seen from the fact of its recognition by the Syrian bishop Theophilus (§ 9, 6). But the Church had gradually lost the power to understand its meaning; moreover in combating a grossly material interpretation, she inevitably became more and more out of sympathy with the Alexandrians. Hence Dionysius of Alexandria now came forward with a criticism, which by a comparison of it with the Gospel and the Epistle, in the course of which he incidentally speaks of the two smaller ones as ascribed to the Apostle, attempted to prove by internal evidence that it could not proceed from him, although

its author, probably the other John who was buried in Ephesus, was nevertheless *ἅγιός τις καὶ θεόπνευστος* who had seen these visions (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 7, 25). But Origen had asserted the same thing of Hermas, and yet his Apocalypse was already given up. Therefore whoever assented to the criticism of Dionysius, which men like Methodius of Tyre and Pamphilus of Cæsarea were certainly not yet prepared to do, must proceed to exclude it also from the New Testament.

2. If we were to take Origen's principle in earnest, it would be necessary to inquire accurately into the usage of the different Churches, in order to find out what writings were employed in them (what was *ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις δεδημοσιευμένον*), and then to examine the old Church-historians as to what was their usage, and what they may have said with respect to the origin and recognition of such writings. This is what Eusebius, according to 3, 3, has done in his Church-history (about 324), in order to make the *ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδοσις* into an *ἐκκλησιαστικὸς κανὼν* (comp. 6, 25), by which to determine what writings belong to the *καινὴ διαθήκη* and should be *ἐνδιάθηκα*. By this means it became at once apparent that between the *ὁμολογούμενα* (*ἀνωμολογημένα*) or *ἀναντίρρητα* (*ἀναμφίλεκτα*), which had the first claim to be *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, and the writings absolutely to be rejected and excluded by the Church (the *παντελῶς νόθα καὶ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀλλότρια*, those *ὡς ἄτοπα πάντη καὶ δυσσεβῆ παρατητέον*) there was also a middle class, which Eusebius sometimes terms *ἀντιλεγόμενα* and sometimes *νόθα*. It must be maintained, at all hazards, that Eusebius made no fundamental distinction between the writings belonging to this middle class, and that with him both appellations are entirely synonymous, and therefore do not point to a difference of view respecting the origin or self-asserted origin, of certain writings, or to their genuineness in our sense of the word, but to an opposition against their reception into the writings

of the New Testament, denying their claim to equality with these and their full right to belong to them.¹ This is already shown by the designation of the third class as παντελῶς νόθα, whose true characteristic, however, does not consist in their being αἰρετικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀναπλάσματα, which ὀνόματι τῶν ἀποστόλων προφέρονται, but in the fact that they οὐδαμῶς ἐν συγγράμματι τῶν κατὰ τὰς διαδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἀνὴρ εἰς μνήμην ἀγαγεῖν ἠξίωσεν (3, 25, 31). It is only by way of example that Eusebius thus characterizes Gospels like those of Peter, Thomas and Matthias, as also the Acta of Andrew, John and other apostles.

3. In the passage where Eusebius promises to give a *resumé* of his researches into the New Testament writings (3, 25) he enumerates as Homologumena τὴν ἀγίαν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τετρακτὺν, οἷς ἔπεται ἡ τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφή, τὰς Παύλου ἐπιστολάς, αἷς ἐξῆς τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννου

¹ Up to the present time we have no certainty in this matter; and yet it is beyond doubt that Eusebius (3, 3) only distinguishes between the ἀναντιβήρητα καὶ τὰ μὴ παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογούμενα θεῖα γράμματα (comp. 3, 25: τὰς τε κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν ἀληθεῖς καὶ ἀπλάστους καὶ ἀνωμολογημένας γραφὰς καὶ τὰς ἄλλως παρὰ ταύτας, οὐκ ἐνδιαθήκους μὲν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντιλεγόμενας, ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γνωσκομένας and 3, 31: ἱερῶν γραμμάτων καὶ τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων μὲν, ὅμως δὲ ἐν πλείστοις ἐκκλησίαις παρὰ πολλοῖς δεδημοσιευμένων), over against which he puts the third class. After having enumerated the ὁμολογούμενα, he calls some ἀντιλεγόμενα, γνώριμα δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, and then continues: ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω καί, in order to close the discussion of this subject with the words: ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων ἂν εἴη. By this means all doubts as to the identity of ἀντιλεγόμενα and νόθα is excluded, a fact which will prove of great value in our discussion of the separate books. Although the ὁμολογούμενη (ἀνωμολογημένη) 3, 16 might appear to refer to the recognised authorship of the first Epistle of Clement by an apostolic disciple (but comp. No. 4), yet on the contrary in 3, 38, it is said of the second: οὐ μὴν ἔθ' ὁμοίως τῇ προτέρᾳ καὶ ταύτην γνῶριμον ἐπιστάμεθα ὅτι μηδὲ τοὺς ἀρχαίους αὐτῇ κεχρημένους ἴσμεν. But when of the Shepherd, who in 3, 25 is named among the νόθοις, we read in 3, 3 that it ἀντιλέλεκται, and can therefore not be counted with the Homologumena, there can be no question as to his doubting its origin from Hermas. Comp. Lücke, *der NTliche Kanon des Eusebius von Cæsarea*, Berlin, 1816.

προτέραν καὶ ὁμοίως τὴν Πέτρον κυρωτέον ἐπιστολήν. It is manifestly for the purpose of avoiding the disputed question of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that he here omits to give the number of the Pauline epistles.¹ Still more remarkable is his mode of treating the Apocalypse, when in this passage, after counting up the Antilegomena, he says, ἐπὶ τούτοις τακτέον, εἶγε φανείη, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ Ἰωάννου, and again in enumerating the νόθα (ἀντιλεγόμενα): ἔτι τε, ὡς ἔφην, ἡ Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυψις, εἰ φανείη, ἣν τινες ἀθετοῦσιν, ὡς ἔφην, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐγκρίνουσι τοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις. But the question as to whether the Apocalypse belongs to the Homologumena is not one of opinion (εἰ φανείη), but simply a *questio facti*, which after all that has been said, he was obliged to answer in the affirmative. From his own words we know that doubts of the apostolicity of the Apocalypse, and therefore of its claim to belong to the New Testament, were first raised by Dionysius of Alexandria, since he is unable to bring forward earlier evidence against it. These doubts had not yet by any means become prevalent (3, 24: τῆς δὲ ἀποκαλύψεως εἰς ἑκάτερον ἔτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς περιέλκεται ἡ δόξα), and he expresses himself very cautiously respecting their origin (3, 39: εἰκὸς οὖν τὸν δεύτερον, εἰ μὴ τις θέλοι τὸν πρῶτον τὴν ἐπ' ὀνόματος φερομένην Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρα-

¹ De Wette is wrong in still maintaining that Origen wavers in his judgment with regard to it. In 3, 3 he says: τοῦ Παύλου πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες ἐπιστολαί. It certainly was his opinion that the Epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in Hebrew, and probably translated by the Roman Clement (3, 38), which, however, he must have forgotten in *Psalm.* 2, 7, or not have adopted; yet in spite of this, in that very passage, he says: How old it is, may be seen from the use made of it in the Epistle of Clement, ἔθεν εἰκότως ἔδοξεν αὐτὸ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐγκαταλεχθῆναι γράμμασι τοῦ ἀποστόλου. In any case he counts it in 3, 3, with the Pauline epistles, but adds that some ἠθετήκασιν it, πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὡς μὴ Παύλου οἶσαν αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες, an assertion more appropriate than his limiting expression: εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισὶν οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀποστόλου τυγχάνειν (6, 20). Hence he also classes it, quite as a matter of course, along with the Epistles of Barnabas, Clement and Jude, in the Antilegomena (6, 13).

κένοι), but they furnished him with a pretext for setting aside the question whether the book should be classed with Homologumena or not. Only his personal wish to reject the apostolic origin and full ecclesiastical validity of the Apocalypse could have influenced him to take this course; for he failed to see that it was in direct opposition to the principle of his division of the New Testament books, which ought to follow ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδοσις or the use of the Scriptures in the Churches and the old Church-historians. These modern critical doubts and the rejection of the Scriptures to which some were thus led, had nothing whatever to do with the question as to whether it had a right to belong to the Homologumena.

4. Among the Antilegomena, Eusebius, in the leading passage (3, 25) first enumerates: ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα ἢ τε Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολή, καὶ ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, εἴτε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχάνουσαι εἴτε καὶ ἑτέρου ὁμωνύμου ἐκείνω. He has therefore adopted the doubts of Origen where both these are concerned, and gives a hint of them in the ὀνομαζομένη, although in *Dem. Evang.*, 3, 5, he speaks quite impartially of several Johannine epistles; but the question of their belonging to the Antilegomena is quite independent of this, as is shown by the εἴτε—εἴτε, since in no case was so old and unanimous a recognition accorded to these two as to the first, as N. T. Scripture.¹ When

¹ Comp. also 3, 24: τῶν Ἰωάννου συγγραμμάτων πρὸς τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ καὶ ἡ προτέρα τῶν ἐπιστολῶν παρὰ τε τοῖς νῦν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἀναμφίλεκτος ὁμολόγηται, ἀντιλέγονται δὲ αἱ λοιπὰ δύο. Eusebius again treats specially of the Petrine epistles in 3, 3, and even calls them τὰ ὀνομαζόμενα Πέτρον, ὧν μόνη μίαν γνησίαν ἔγνω ἐπιστολὴν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πάλαι πρεσβυτέροις ὁμολογουμένην, so that we might be led to suppose that he did not consider the second as genuine in our sense of the word. Yet we never hear that he entertained doubts with regard to its Petrine origin; on the contrary he only says that ἡ λεγομένη αὐτοῦ προτέρα ἀνωμολόγηται ταύτη δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλαι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφίλεκτῳ ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακείμενται συγγράμμασι, τὴν δὲ φερομένην δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιαθήκων μὲν εἶναι παρελήφαμεν· ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν. Hence the exclusion of the second epistle from the διαθήκη, as limited

he speaks of the ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα, it is plain the expression only means that the current designation contains no indication as to the James and Jude from whom the epistles proceed. But we see this more clearly from 2, 23, where he takes from Hegesippus a reference to the brother of the Lord who stood at the head of the Church in Jerusalem, and then adds: οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται.² If the statements of Eusebius with respect to the first five Antilegomena, which had already taken their position as ἐνδιάθηκα show how inaccurately and inconsistently he expresses himself, this is the case to a still greater degree where the others are concerned, which had already disappeared more or less from the official usage of the Church. From the fact of his putting the πράξεις Παύλου, the ποιμὴν and the ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου first among them, Credner suspects, probably not without reason, that he has in his mind a list of New Testament writings such as the *versus scripturarum* in the Cod. Clar., which also enumerates these very three (No. 1).³

on the ground of tradition by the Homologumena, is due solely to the fact that it was not yet made use of by the ancients, just as the pseudonymous Petrine writings (αἱ ἐπικεκλημένα πράξεις, τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν ὀνομασμένον εὐαγγέλιον, τὸ λεγόμενον αὐτοῦ κήρυγμα, ἡ καλουμένη ἀποκάλυψις) were afterwards scrupulously separated from it.

² When he goes on to say: ἰστέον, ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν (οὗ πολλοὶ γοῶν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μᾶς καὶ αὐτῆς οὐσης τῶν ἐπτά λεγομένων καθολικῶν), ὅμως δ' ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείστοις δεδημοσιευμένας ἐκκλησίαις, it is clear that the νοθεύεται only refers to the opposition to its having an equal right to belong to the διαθήκη (on account of its not having been used by the ancients), which made it necessary to class both among the Antilegomena (comp. also 6, 14). But this does not exclude the possible view that these, along with 2nd Peter and 2nd and 3rd John, had by their classification with the seven ἐπιστολαὶ καθολικαί (No. 1) already acquired a rightful place in the διαθήκη. This is the sole reason why in the leading passage (3, 25) the other Antilegomena are attached to these with the words ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω καί, and thus separated from them, without being put by him in any other class, as Credner, Bleck, Hilgenfeld and others nevertheless maintain.

³ Of the *Acta Pauli* likewise he only says (3, 3) : οὐκ ἐν ἀναμφιλέτοις

These are followed by the *Epistle of Barnabas* (καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις ἡ φερομένη Βαρνάβα ἐπιστολή), which in 6, 14 is classed with the Antilegomena, along with the Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic epistles, and therefore certainly does not belong to another class (comp. also 6, 13). Finally, as the fifth book he names τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί, to which we have found no reference as yet, while he makes no mention whatever in this connection of the κήρυγμα Πέτρου, in spite of its use by Clement and Origen, manifestly because he puts it in the category of heretical pseudonymous writings (3, 3). But he seems to have passed over the Epistle of Clement with design, for though in 6, 13 he puts it in the list of Antilegomena between Barnabas and Jude, in 3, 38 he expressly characterises it as ἀνωμολογημένη παρὰ πᾶσιν, and in 3, 16 as ὁμολογουμένη (comp. No. 2, note 1), adding ταύτην δὲ καὶ ἐν πλείσταις ἐκκλησίαις ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ δεδημοσιευμένην πάλαι τε καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἔγνωμεν. We have seen how he was led to this conclusion (4, 23) by a misunderstood passage of Dionysius of Corinth (§ 7, 7); but having so decided, he could only reckon the epistle among the Homologumena, although as a matter of fact it had already disap-

παρεϊλήφαμεν, thus numbering them with the Antilegomena, while on the other hand, of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, he says: ἰστέον, ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς μὲν τινῶν ἀντιλελεκται, δι' οὗς οὐκ ἂν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις τεθείη, ὅφ' ἐτέρων δὲ ἀναγκαιότατον οἷς μάλιστα δεῖ στοιχειώσεως εἰσαγωγικῆς κέκριται ὅθεν ἤδη καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίαις ἴσμεν αὐτὸ δεδημοσιευμένον (comp. the Muratorian Canon), καὶ τῶν παλαιωτάτων δὲ συγγραφέων (comp. e.g. Clement, Iren., Orig.) κεκρημένους τινὰς αὐτῷ κατεληφα. This is more than he has said or could say of any of the first five Antilegomena, which clearly shows that it would be impossible to put them in one of these different classes. On the other hand it is an exaggerated statement when, in face of what we know of the Muratorian Canon (§ 10, 3), he asserts (3, 3) that the *Apocalypse of Peter* belongs to those which οὐδ' ὄλωσ ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένα, ὅτι μήτε ἀρχαίων μήτε μὴν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τις ἐκκλησιαστικὸς συγγραφεὺς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν συνεκρήσατο μαρτυρίας, especially if we consider that he puts the Gospel of Peter, which in 3, 25 he names among the forgeries of the heretics, in the same category. In 6, 14, he himself expressly includes this *Apocalypse* in the Antilegomena, on which Clement commented in his Hypotyposes.

peared from the usage of the Church. For this reason he is here silent respecting it, as also with regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews on similar grounds.⁴

The importance of Eusebius for the history of the formation of the Canon is commonly very much overrated. We are indebted to him for an abundance of material for this history, however incomplete in many respects, and however obscure and untrustworthy may be his statements founded upon it; while nearly all that later Church-teachers pretend to know of this history is taken entirely from him. But it is a manifest error to suppose that his learned compilations and discussions had an epoch-making influence on the formation of the Canon. On the contrary he himself depends invariably on the ecclesiastical usage of his own time, as is shown by his wavering and to some extent unfair and unequal judgments of individual Antilegomena, while his whole aim is to make them accord with the *ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδοσις*.⁵ That the object of the Emperor Constantine when, in the beginning of the thirtieth year, he directed Eusebius to have fifty copies of the holy Scriptures drawn up on parchment, for certain newly-built churches in Constantinople (*Vita*,

⁴ When, in conclusion, he mentions that some have even put the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* among the *νόθα* (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*), his object manifestly is to account for the fact of Hegesippus, Clement and Origen having used it. At his time it was already with justice included in the category of heretical writings (No. 2), evidently in consequence of the use made of it by the Ebionites (3, 27).

⁵ The facts established by him furnish no grounds for separating the five Catholic epistles from the other Antilegomena, as he himself virtually admits; from the standpoint of *ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδοσις*, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Apocalypse of Peter, most unfairly judged by him, had at least the same right as these; nevertheless the position in the New Testament acquired by the former even before the time of Eusebius, remained unshaken, while the position of the latter was lost and remained so. His prudent silence respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews and that of Clement had just as little power to shake the usage accorded to the former from the time of Origen, as to give back to the latter the position it had lost for so long. The assignment of the *Acta Pauli*, the *κῆρυγμὰ Πέτρου* or even of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, to the Antilegomena, however just in principle, had no influence on ecclesiastical usage so far as we know. It was not even his position with regard to the Apocalypse that first gave rise to the lasting dispute respecting it in the East; the fact that where it is concerned he breaks with his clear principles, only shows what influence the recently awakened critical doubts which were never quite silenced in the East, had on him as a scholar.

Const., IV. 36, 9), was to set up a universally valid collection of sacred writings as a legally binding rule, as Credner supposes, and that we can still prove the extent and order of this imperial Bible which became normative for the Greek Church, as Volkmar maintained, are pure fancies. It is only certain that the Council of Nice came to a decision respecting important dogmas, without a determination of the sources on which their verdict was based, and that Constantine's mandate, which applied to those Divine writings whose restoration and use Eusebius recognised as necessary out of regard for the Church, undoubtedly presupposes that as yet there was no official determination respecting the books which belonged to the sacred Scriptures. In any case it is natural to suppose that these fifty copies of the Bible decked out with imperial munificence, all of which as a matter of course had the same extent and arrangement, had a greater influence in establishing a fixed usage than all the learned discussions of Eusebius; but unfortunately we have no knowledge of this imperial Bible, and cannot tell how far Eusebius in drawing it up followed his own theory, or the usage that was in many respects at variance with it.

5. It is certain that from the middle of the fourth century the want of a fixed limitation of the number of the holy Scriptures, was more and more keenly felt. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his *Catechetics* (4, 20), lays stress on the importance of zeal in learning from the Church what are the writings of the Old and New Testament, τὰ παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογούμενα; and in reading μηδὲν τῶν ἀποκρύφων. The Council of Laodicea in its 59th Canon, about 363, ordains that no ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία should be read in the Church, but μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης; but since the 60th Canon, whose list of the Scriptures exactly agrees with that of Cyril, is open to suspicion, it remains doubtful whether they are expressly enumerated. Athanasius of Alexandria in his *Epistola festalis* (365) reckons up τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία, for the sake of those who confound the λεγόμενα ἀπόκρυφα with the γραφὴ θεόπνευστος. Gregory of Nazianzen and Amphilochius of Iconium have even put this enumeration into verse, the former in his 33rd Carmen, which concludes with the words εἴ τι τούτων ἔκτος, οὐκ ἐν γνησίοις; while the latter in his *Iambi*

ad Seleucum ends with οὗτος ἀψευδέστατος κανὼν ἂν εἴη τῶν θεοπνεύστων γραφῶν. To the fourth century belong also finally the lists of Epiphanius Bishop of Constantia (the ancient Salamis) in Cyprus, who loved to call them ἐνδιάθετοι in contradistinction from the ἀπόκρυφοί (*de Pond. et Mens.*, 10), and of Chrysostom (if the *Synopsis Vet. et Nov. Test.*, found in his works proceeds from him), and probably also the 85th among the *Canones Apostolici*. Hence we have here in addition to the expressions ὁμολογούμενα and γνήσια (to which in Amphilochius νόθον forms the antithesis), current from the time of Eusebius the first use of the term *Canonical* as applied to those writings that werè valid in the Church. But this can by no means apply to such books as have the force of law in the Catholic Church, as Credner supposes, nor yet to those which form or contain the doctrinal norm, as is generally assumed, but only to those which are marked off by the norm predominant in the Church, (the κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός, ap. Euseb., 6, 25).¹ At earliest, quite at the end of the fourth century, Isidore of Pelus. first says : τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας, τὰς θείας φημὶ γραφὰς κατοπτεύσωμεν (*Epist.*, 4, 114). Here therefore the holy Scriptures themselves have taken the place of oral apostolic tradition as the doctrinal

¹ Baur in the *Zeitschrift für wiss. Theol.*, 1885, 1, in accordance with Sewler, maintained that κανὼν was the list of books appointed to be read in the Church, and has been followed by Holtzmann and partly also by Mangold (but compare § 10, 5, note 2); yet even with Amphilochius the κανὼν τ. θεοπν. γρ. is the rule previously laid down by him for determining which books belong to the New Testament. The usage of the Alexandrian grammarians, put forward by Hilgenfeld, according to which the term κανὼν is applied to the whole body of standard classical authors is here not to the point, since the writings themselves are not yet called by the name of κανὼν. Compare the later σύνοψις τῆς θείας γραφῆς, known under the name of Athanasius and still representative of his views, where mention is repeatedly made of the ὀρισμένά τε καὶ κεκατονισμένα βιβλία (comp. also Isid. Pelus., *Ep.* 1, 369, ἐνδιάθετα καὶ κεκατονισμ. βιβλ.), So too in Chrysostom, hom. 58 on *Gen.*, the κανὼν θείας γραφῆς, which is contrasted with the οἰκείοι λογισμοί, is not the Canon of the Scriptures, but the doctrinal norm taken from Scripture.

norm, in the sense in which the expression Canon is now used by us. On the other hand, the expression *apocryphal* (§ 10, 5, note 3), formerly so much more comprehensive and simple, is now by Cyril, Athanasius and Epiphanius employed in the definite sense, *rejected by the Church*. So long indeed as it was still fresh in the memory that much now regarded as uncanonical formerly held a high place in the estimation of the Church, there was necessarily a middle class. Although Cyril expressly prohibits the reading even in private of that which was not read in the Church, yet he speaks of τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα, which should be ἐξω κείσθαι ἐν δευτέρῳ and only says, if any one be not acquainted with the Homologumena, τί περὶ τὰ ἀμφιβαλλόμενα τάλαιπωρεῖς μάτην; but Athanasius expressly makes a distinction between the ἀπόκρυφα and the ἕτερα βιβλία οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεισθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον. This is the last attempt in the Greek Church, so far as we know, to retain a certain importance in the Church for the books which formerly struggled for such recognition; but of these ἀναγινωσκόμενα only the διδαχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων and the Shepherd of Hermas come into consideration for the New Testament.

6. The lists of the second half of the fourth century substantially agree in putting the four Gospels and the Acts, fourteen Pauline and seven Catholic epistles into the Canon. On the other hand the *Apocalypse* is wanting in Cyril, Gregory of Nazianzen, Chrysostom, in the Canon of the Synod of Laodicea and the Apostolic Canons. The *Iambi ad Seleucum*, say: τινὲς μὲν ἐγκρίνουσιν, οἱ πλείους δὲ γε νόθον λέγουσιν. Possibly the extent to which the *Apocalypse* was rejected, is here somewhat overestimated.¹ Moreover in the fifth

¹ The Alexandrian Church certainly retained it, after the precedent set by Athanasius, as Didymus, Makarius and Cyril of Alexandria show, the two great Cappadocians, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa use it, and

century, when it was commented upon by Andreas and Arethas, the opposition to it appears to have become more and more silent, our oldest Greek Codd. (Sin., Alex., Ephr. Syr.) contain it: and though the Alexandrian deacon Euthalius did not set it apart with the epistles for public reading in the Church, this only proves that its recognition as a sacred, canonical book, equal to those of the Bible, did not necessarily include its being publicly read in the Church, as we have already seen in the Syrian Church (§ 10, 1). Leontius of Byzantium at the end of the sixth century, and John Damascenus in the eighth, have it in their lists; at the Œcumenical Council of 692, all remembrance of the controversy on this point was so completely lost, that its second Canon reckons up the ancient authorities for the Canon in the most naïve way, even those that contradict each other on this point. How certain the East was that the *Epistle to the Hebrews* belonged to those of Paul, is shown by the fact that from the time of Athanasius, it has generally been ranked with the Pauline Church-letters, so that it came to be placed after 2 Thess. and before the Pastoral Epistles. It occupies this place not only in the above-named Greek Codd., but also in the Cod. Vatic.² Nor has there been since any doubt in the great imperial Church as to the ecclesiastical recognition of the seven *Catholic Epistles*.³

through Ephrem it seems to have penetrated even into the Syrian Church, where the great Antiochian expositors Theodore of Mops. and Theodoret certainly do not use it. On the other hand Epiphanius not only has it in his Canon, but even characterizes it (*Hær.*, 77) as *παρὰ πλεστοῖς πεπιστευμένη*.

² The reason why the *Iambi ad Seleucum* mention the Epistle to the Hebrews last, is that they still remember, though possibly with disapproval, the opposition to it, which can hardly be more than a scholarly reminiscence from Eusebius. The Arians naturally rejected it on doctrinal grounds: hence it is also wanting in the Gothic Bible.

³ The statement of the *Iambi ad Sel.*, that some count seven, others only three, refers not to the distinction made by Eusebius between the Homologumena among them and the Antilegumena, but to the fact that

Even with Cyril and Athanasius, as well as in the Vatic., Alex., and Eph. Syr., they are put before the Pauline epistles, while Gregory, Amphilochius, Epiphanius and the Sinaitic MS. still retain the historical remembrance that they were first ranked with the Pauline epistles. The respective order which they almost universally occupy is the following; the Epistle of James stands first, then the Epistles of Peter and John, while the Epistle of Jude comes last. The *Acts*, which in every other case follow the Gospels, are in Epiphanius put with the Catholic epistles, the Apocalypse is invariably at the end.

How it happens that in the Constit. Apost. 2, 57, the Catholic Epistles are wanting besides the Apocalypse, can no longer be ascertained, but the fact has no such importance for the history of the Canon as is attributed to it by Credner, since according to all historical evidence, it was never entirely wanting. They, as well as the Apocalypse, are indeed omitted from the *Topographia Christiana* of Kosmas Indicopleustes (in the sixth century); but how little significance this had, is shown by a passage in the seventh book, which controverts the views contained in 2 Pet. iii. 12, and on this occasion asserts *ὅτι τὰς καθολικὰς ἢ ἐκκλησια ἀμφιβαλλομένας ἔχει*. He appeals in support of this to Irenæus, Eusebius, Athanasius, and Amphilochius; of whom, however, we have authentic information to the contrary. So, too, when the Egyptian monk Didymus (towards the end of the fourth century), who himself wrote a short explanation of the seven Catholic epistles, and used the second Epistle of Peter without scruple, calls it *falsata, quæ licet publicetur, non tamen est in canone*, which by no means applies to a forgery in our sense, but is plainly a translation of *νοθεύεται* in the Eusebian sense; or when Theodor. of Mopsuestia, *Epistolam Jacobi et alias deinceps aliorum catholicas abrogat et antiquat*, a reproach made against him by his opponents, we must regard such statements as scholarly reminiscences. Even Chrysostom, in his Homily on the Epistle to Philemon, mentions that some assert *περιστὸν εἶναι τὸ καὶ ταύτην προσκείσθαι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν εἴγε ὑπὲρ πράγματος μαροῦ ἤξιωσεν, ὑπὲρ ἐνὸς ἀνδρός*. These things have no significance whatever for ecclesiastical usage as such.

7. Although in the East the Canon thus appears from the

the Syrian Bible had only three of them (§ 10, 1), just as the Synopsis in the works of Chrysostom enumerates only three. But even in Ephrem's time there was a complete Syrian translation of the Bible, and the old Syrian Canon was retained only by the Nestorians.

second half of the fourth century as virtually closed, except for the uncertainty with respect to the Apocalypse, which lasted for some time longer, yet there was no actual official determination regarding it, since even the Trullan Synod does not enumerate the Canonical books. This naturally does not exclude the possibility of an older usage being retained in individual Churches or circles of Churches. Thus we saw how the ancient Church-bible continued to influence the Syrian Church for a long time (No. 6, note 3), and how long the use of Tatian's Diatessaron, in place of, or together with the four Gospels was there retained (§ 7, 6). Gregory of Nazianzen, notwithstanding his express enumeration of the contents of the Canon, yet quotes passages from the *κήρυγμα Πέτρου* quite freely (Orat. 16, Epist. 16, in Hilgenfeld, *Einl.*, p. 120, note 2), while Sozomen, in his Church History, mentions that in some churches of Palestine the Apocalypse of Peter was still read on Good Friday (7, 19), and Jerome, that the Shepherd of Hermas was in his day still read in some Greek churches (*de Vir. Ill.*, 10). In the Apostolic Canons, the two Epistles of Clement and the *διαταγαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων* are ranked with the New Testament writings; and Epiphanius alludes to the former as *ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις ἐκκλησίαις ἀναγιγνωσκόμεναι* (*Hæc.*, 30, 15), while Jerome says of the first epistle at least that it "in nonnullis locis etiam publice legitur" (*de Vir. Ill.*, 15), as he states of the Epistle of Polycarp (*ibid.*, 17: "quæ usque hodie in Asiæ conventu legitur").¹ The fact that the Clementine epistles and those

¹ Whether actual reading at public service is here meant, and whether the statements respecting this or the Epistles of Clement may not be traced entirely to the erroneous account of Eusebius (*H. E.*, 4, 23, comp. § 7, 5) is at least very doubtful. The list appended to the writing of the Antiochian Patriarch Anastasius Sinaita (end of the fifth century), from which the Apocalypse is omitted, while on the other hand the Apocalypse of Peter, the *περίοδοι καὶ διδαχαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Acts of Paul and an Apocalypse of Paul, the "διδασκαλία" of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, and finally the Gospels *κατὰ Βαρνάβαν* and *κατὰ Μαθθίαν*, are enumerated as *ἐκτός* or *ἔξω τῶν ἑ'* (the

of Barnabas and Hermas are classed with the New Testament, the former in the Cod. Alex., the latter in the Cod. Sin., authorizes no conclusion as to their recognition in the Church, since it is by no means clear that these MSS. were designed for ecclesiastical use. But it is certain that no ecclesiastical importance can be attached to learned compositions such as the Synopsis in the works of Athanasius, the Stichometry of Nicephorus, or the classification of the Scriptures which Junilius (§ 1, 2, note 1) professes to have received from a Persian of the name of Paul of the school of Nisibis, since these may all be traced back more or less to Eusebius.²

§ 12. THE CLOSE OF THE CANON IN THE WEST.

1. The doubts regarding the Apocalypse, which swayed the East so long, never penetrated to the West. When Philastrius of Brescia, in the second half of the fourth cen-

tical books) together with a number of Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphs in motley combination, seems to me equally uncertain in origin and importance.

² The Stichometry added by Nicephorus the Patriarch of Constantinople, at the beginning of the ninth century, to his Chronography, is at all events considerably older. Like Eusebius, it divides the Scriptures that have been handed down into three classes: *ἐκκλησιαζόμενα καὶ κεκατονισμένα, ἀντιλεγόμενα, and ἀπόκρυφα*. The Apocalypse of John and Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, here belong to the second class. On the other hand, the Epistles of Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Hermas, are put in the third class, along with the Gospel of Thomas, with entirely apocryphal *περὶ τοῦ Πέτρου, τοῦ Ἰωάννου, καὶ τοῦ Θωμά*, and with the Didache, which enumerates the pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis with the Clementines among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* or *ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα*. Here we still see indeed the influence of the Eusebian classification, but all understanding of its meaning, as well as that of the writings treated of in the last two classes, has disappeared. The list in Junilius on the contrary, instead of adopting the Eusebian terminology, calls the three classes *perfectæ, mediæ, and nullius auctoritatis*, but puts the Apocalypse, "de qua apud orientales admodum dubitatur," and the five Catholic epistles from the Eusebian Antilegomena, into the second.

ture, speaks of "hæretici qui evangelium secundum Johannem et apocalypsin ipsius non accipiunt" (*de Hær.*, 60), it is plain that he refers to the Alogi of Epiphanius; he evidently has no knowledge of the existence, even in ecclesiastical circles, of such as do not recognise the Apocalypse. Hence the five epistles which in the second half of the third century were ranked with 1 Peter and 1 John, made their way over to the West with greater ease, as we have already seen from the Stichometry of the Cod. Clarom. (§ 11, 1); no Church could fail to be pleased by an addition to the costly treasure of apostolic writings.¹ We now find the collection of the *septem aliæ epistolæ*, besides those of Paul, current in the Church. The Epistle to the Hebrews was not so readily admitted into the Pauline series, since the West preserved the fixed tradition that it was not Pauline, until after the third century; and in accordance with its stricter usage, excluded it from the New Testament. But in the fourth century, owing to the study of Origen and frequent contact with the Eastern Church, it was gradually adopted even by the West. Hilarius of Pictavium, Victorin, Lucifer of Calaris, and Ambrosius of Milan, use it as Pauline. But Philastrius nevertheless shows that "alii quoque sunt, qui epistolam Pauli ad Hebræos non adserunt esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut Barnabæ esse apostoli aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi, alii autem Lucæ evangelistæ" (chap. 89). The Hypotheses of the Alexandrians stand there beside the old African tradition (§ 9, 4) without in any way disturbing him in his faith in the Epistola Pauli.² The West had no-

¹ When Philastrius says that these "septem Actibus apostolorum conjunctæ sunt" (chap. 88), he obviously knows that although he only puts them after the Pauline epistles, yet they are in general joined directly with the Acts, or else these are on their account put after the Pauline epistles (§ 11, 6). Moreover, it is plain that with him the Epistles of Peter come first on account of the cathedra Petri, as already in the above-named Stichometry, and the Epistle of James at the end.

² It has been erroneously supposed that Philastrius himself was still

thing to give up in order to make its Canon accord with that of the East, since it had never had any desire to go beyond the number of the apostolic writings. As a matter of fact, therefore, the Canon of Athanasius here prevailed, and with it the idea that the *statutum* of the apostles and their successors had already decided that only these *Scripturæ canonicæ* should be read in the Church. Contrasted with these, we have in chap. 88 the *Scripturæ absconditæ*, i.e. Apocrypha, a term which here implies no condemnation of them, but only points out that they were excluded from the Canon; for it is expressly said of them: "etsi legi debent morum causa a perfectis, non ab omnibus legi debent."

2. The reconciliation of the West with the East, the way to which was hitherto being prepared of itself, was designedly completed at the end of the fourth century by Rufinus and Jerome, scholars who were equally at home in both sections of the Church. The West appropriated the works of Origen through the translations of the former, and the learned compilations of Eusebius through the diligent labours of the latter. Only what was favourable to a firmer form of ecclesiastical usage, was taken from them. Rufinus, in his *Expositio Symb. Apost.*, repeatedly gives expression to the opinion that it is the part of the *traditio majorum*, raised *ex patrum monumentis*, to determine the extent of the inspired Scriptures. He has no longer a doubt that the *patres concluderunt* a definite number of these *intra canonem, ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt*. The term Canon

in doubt respecting it, or that its ecclesiastical recognition was still a matter of dispute, whereas he expressly adduces (*ibid.*) as the reason why it is not in "ecclesia legitur populo," or only at intervals, "quia addiderunt in ea quædam non bene sentientes." For the same reason, in chap. 88 also, where those books which alone may be read in the Church are enumerated, only *tredecim epistolæ Pauli* are named. The reason that the Apocalypse is wanting here too, must simply be that this book was not regarded as adapted for ecclesiastical reading, as was the case in the Syrian Church. But it unquestionably belongs to the *Scripturæ canonicæ*.

evidently seems here to be applied without hesitation to the whole body of normative Scriptures (§ 11, 5), the number of these having previously been closed. Jerome expressly states that in the determination of the Canon he follows "nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem." From this standpoint he could neither take it amiss that the Greek Church of his time in many cases did not accept the Apocalypse, nor that the *consuetudo Latinorum non recipit* the Epistle to the Hebrews *inter Scripturas canonicas*,¹ though he himself accepted both. Thus Rufinus and Jerome are led to adopt the twenty-seven New Testament books of Athanasius, which are so arranged by the latter that the Actus Apost. form the transition from the Pauline Epistles to the *Septem Epistolæ*, first among which stands James, after the Grecian manner (*Ep. 103 ad Paul.*). Both likewise follow Athanasius in adopting besides the *libri canonici*, a second class of writings, "quæ legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam" (Ruf., *Expos.*, 38), "ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem dogmatum confirmandam" (Hieron., *præf. ad Salom.*), only that they are termed "ecclesiastici libri a majoribus appellati" by the

¹ He has frequently given expression to this (*Comm. in Jes.*, cap. vi. 8); and he expressly states, that the same "usque hodie apud Romanos quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur" (*de Vir. Ill.*, 59), that *omnes Græci recipiunt* it, but *nonnulli Latinorum* (*Ep. 125 ad Evagr.*), while *multi Latinorum de ea dubitant* (*In Matt.*, cap. xxvi.). He himself quotes it pretty often without scruple as Pauline, and again with the words, *si quis vult recipere eam epistolam* (*Comm. in Tit. i.*, in *Ezech. xviii.*, in *Ephes. ii.*), or with *qui ad Hebræos scripsit epistolam* (*Comm. in Amos viii.*, in *Jes. lvii.*), *sive Paulus sive quis alius* (in *Jer. xxxi.*, in *Tit. ii.*). Again, he specifies the seven Churches to which Paul wrote, after the manner of the Latins, and sums up the different views respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews (*de Vir. Ill.*, 5), of which he says: "octava enim ad Hebr. a plerisque extra numerum ponitur" (*Ep. 103 ad Paul.*). Finally, in the chief passage quoted in the text it is said: "nihil interest, cujus sit, cum ecclesiastici viri sit et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur" (*Ep. 129 ad Dardanum*).

former, and "apocryphi" by the latter, who here only goes back, however, to the oldest phraseology, while Rufinus and Philastrius regard Apocryphal as the absolute antithesis to Canonical. The only other work regarded by both as belonging to the New Testament is the Shepherd of Hermas. The scholarly reminiscences of former doubts respecting individual New Testament writings, brought forward by Jerome, particularly from Eusebius, were neither regarded by himself as important, nor had they any influence on the Church.²

3. Final sanction was first given to the views of these two scholars by the all-predominating ecclesiastical authority of Augustine. He looks on the "canonica auctoritas veteris et novi testamenti apostolorum" as "per successiones episcoporum et propagationes ecclesiarum constituta et custodita" (*Contr. Faust.* 11, 5; 33, 6). In his work *de Doctrina Christiana* (2, 8) he develops a detailed theory as to how, in determining the *scripturæ canonicæ*, the "auctoritas ecclesiarum catholicarum quam plurimum" must be followed, "inter quas illæ sint, quæ apostolicas sedes habere et epistolas accipere meruerunt." He makes a distinction between such as are accepted by all, and such as "plures gravioreque accipiunt" or "pauciores minorisque auctoritatis ecclesiæ." He even mentions the improbable case where one class might have the *plures*, the other the *graviore*, in its favour, and thus both be equal in authority. But this is simply an academical discussion respecting the various degrees of canonicity, by

² Thus in the *Præf. in Ep. ad Philem.* he also speaks of those who refuse to accept this epistle on account of its private character (comp. § 11, 6), and mentions that the "secunda Petri a plerisque ejus negatur propter stili dissonantiam" (*de Vir. Ill.*, 1), that the Epistle of James "ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur, licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem" (*ibid.*, cap. ii.), that the Epistle of Jude a plerisque rejicitur on account of the citation from Enoch (*ibid.*, 4), that 2nd and 3rd John *Johannis presbyteri asseruntur* (*ibid.*, 9, comp. 18; a plerisque). The exaggerated way in which he retails these doubts contrasts strangely enough indeed with the utter insignificance they have in influencing his ecclesiastical recognition of the writings.

which he accommodates himself to the sometimes wavering judgment of the past and even of the present, but which he does not carry to any practical issue. For he concludes: "Totus autem canon scripturarum, in quo istam considerationem versandam dicimus, his libris continetur," and then proceeds to enumerate our twenty-seven N. Test. books, the four Gospels, fourteen Pauline epistles, those of Peter first among the rest, and the Acts and Apocalypse at the end. Only with respect to the Epistle to the Hebrews could a question actually arise in his mind, and of it he simply says: "quamquam nonnullis incerta sit . . . magisque me movet auctoritas ecclesiarum orientalium, quæ hanc quoque in canonicis habent" (*de Pecc. Merit. et Rem.*, 1, 27).¹ Under Augustine's influence the Council of Carthage (397) renewed the decrees of that of Hippo (393), in whose 36th Canon it is ordained, as thirty years before in Laodicea: "Ut præter scripturas canonicas nihil legatur sub nomine divinarum scripturarum," only that the reading of the Passiones Martyrum is reserved for their festivals, and the twenty-seven N. T. writings then enumerated. But that the reception of the Epistle to the Hebrews still gave rise to some disputes is shown by the way in which it is ranked with the *Pauli apostoli epistolæ tredecim* as *ejusdem ad Hebræos una*. It was first by a later council at Carthage (419) that these decrees were repeated, under his influence also, only that the Pauline epistles are now simply counted as fourteen. In enumerating these, merely to class it with the Church-epistles, as was mostly done by the Greeks, did not become

¹ This is the more significant, since he, for his part, cites it as Pauline or apostolic much less frequently than Jerome, but, on the contrary, in general as "Epistola ad Hebræos or quæ scribitur ad Hebræos." He also expressly says that indeed "plures eam apostoli Pauli esse dicunt, quidam vero negant" (*de Civit. Dei*, 6, 22), or that "nonnulli eam in canonem scripturarum recipere timuerunt" (*Inch. Expos. Ep. ad Rom.*, 11). But this does not prevent his counting fourteen Pauline epistles in his canon, though he puts the Epistle to the Hebrews at the end.

usual in the West, since the only passage in Jerome where this happens is conditioned by the enumeration of the seven Churches. The position of the seven other epistles, nowhere else termed catholic, after those of Paul, was likewise adhered to; but in their order the Epistles of Peter come first, while sometimes John, sometimes James and Jude, come last; except with Jerome, who follows the Greek method. The Acts sometimes retain their old place after the Gospels, sometimes they form the transition to the Catholic epistles as in Jerome, while occasionally they are even put after these, as in Augustine. The Apocalypse invariably forms the conclusion.

4. A decision respecting the Canon of binding efficacy for the whole Church, was not arrived at, even in the West. The Carthaginian Synods applied in vain to the Romish chair for confirmation of their decrees; we have no knowledge of its having been granted. Pelagius and the later Pelagians, in their confessions of faith, repeatedly declared: "Novum et vetus testamentum recipimus in eo librorum numero, quem ecclesiæ catholicæ tradit auctoritas." But the Church did not speak. Only on behalf of the Church of Spain, in which, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Council of Toledo (400), a number of apocryphal writings were constantly circulated, did Innocent I., at the urgent entreaty of the Archbishop Exsuperius of Tolosa, address a letter to him in which he condemned the heretical works, and laid down a list of the books *qui recipiuntur in canone* (405). This list entirely corresponds to the Canon of Augustine, except that among the Catholic epistles those of John stand first. Leo the Great, in consequence of the complaints of Turribius, Bishop of Asturia, with regard to the spread of heretical works, was also obliged to take stringent repressive measures (447). Hence it was mainly the authority of Jerome and Augustine which determined the ecclesiastical usage of the West. To this, Cassiodorus, in whom we find

the seven epistles under the name of the *Epistolæ Canonicæ* (§ 11, 1), appeals in his *Institutiones* (§ 1, 2), about the middle of the sixth century; he evidently knows nothing of a decision on the part of the Romish chair.¹ When the Arian Goths of the West, who had neither the Epistle to the Hebrews in their Canon, nor probably the Apocalypse, went over to Catholicism (589), the question regarding the latter writing at least was stirred up afresh, and the fourth Council of Toledo (632) found it necessary to threaten with excommunication those who rejected it. Archbishop Isidore of Seville, who was present at this council, has in his works repeatedly enumerated the N. Test. books, and following the example of Jerome, has imparted various information regarding the older doubts with respect to some of them. We have also lists from his friends and pupils, the Bishops Eugenius and Ildefons of Toledo († 667), who attached themselves mainly to Augustine, a sign showing how necessary in Spain it still was to strengthen the religious consciousness as to what writings belonged to the New Testament.

¹ For this very reason the *decretum Gelasii de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, said to have been composed in 494 at a synod in Rome, and which Hilgenfeld and Holtzmann trace back even in its basis to Damasus (366-84), can hardly be genuine. It exists in various forms, which are traced back partly to Damasus, partly to Gelasius, partly to Hormisdas. The various recensions differ very much in their order; in that which is traced back to Gelasius himself, only thirteen Epist. Pauli are adduced, the Epistle to the Hebrews is entirely wanting, and the seven follow under the name of apostolical; in the Damasus-recension of the *Epistolæ Canonicæ*, 2nd and 3rd John are attributed to the Presbyter, the Epistle of Jude to Judas Zelotes. Among the books expressly prohibited we find along with others the Shepherd and the *Acta Pauli et Theclæ*. But it must be clear that the Epistle to the Hebrews could not have been excluded by the Roman bishop at the end of the fifth century, when his predecessors Damasus and Innocent I. had counted it directly among the Pauline epistles. In any case, a Canon like that of Gelasius must be much older, and might rather be assigned to the middle of the fourth century, at which time it is conceivable that the smaller Johannine epistles might be traced back to the Presbyter, as in the Damasus-recension.

5. The middle ages had neither the power to take up an independent position as opposed to tradition, nor yet the means of testing it.¹ They did not even prove themselves strong enough to preserve in purity what had been handed down.² In consequence of the Council of Florence, Eugenius IV., in his bull of 1441, once more repeated the Canon of Augustine, and this was the first time that the Romish chair ventured to give a decision of universal validity in the matter of the Canon. But after the middle of the fifteenth century, the newly-awakened study of antiquity brought up again the old scruples with regard to individual N. T. writings. What the Cardinal Thomas de Vio (Cajetan) incidentally asserts respecting the Epistle of James is, it is true, only a reminiscence of Jerome's; but with regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews, he went so far as to maintain that if, according to Jerome, its author was doubtful,

¹ Reminiscences of Jerome's communications respecting the older views and doubts with regard to individual canonical books, become more and more rare, as in Honorius of Autun and John of Salisbury in the twelfth century. Thomas Aquinas has the idea that these only existed until the Nicene Council; and Nicolaus of Lyra, who discusses the question of the Epistle to the Hebrews at greater length, is content to believe that the Church at Nicæa accepted it as apostolic. Where, as in Hugo à S. Victore, a threefold division of the writings handed down again crops up, all apprehension of the original meaning of such a division is wanting, since the Gospels alone are referred to the first *ordo*, and the Decretals and the Scripta Sanctorum Patrum to the third.

² Philastrius perhaps mentions (comp. § 31, 4) an *Epistola Pauli ad Laodicenses* (*de Hær.*, 89), of which also Jerome says: "Ab omnibus exploditur" (*de Vir. Ill.*, 5). Gregory I., however, is persuaded that Paul wrote fifteen epistles, though the Church *non amplius quam XIV. tenet* (*Moralium Libr.*, 35, 25). But the Laodicean Epistle is afterwards in many cases received among the Pauline Epistles, so that the second Nicene Council (787) found it necessary to prohibit it, notwithstanding which in the English Church of the ninth century we frequently find fifteen Pauline Epistles enumerated; in the Codd. Angiensis and Boernerianus of the ninth century, as well as in MSS. of the Vulgate especially English ones, it is received among the Pauline Epistles. The Shepherd of Hermas also crops up again in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, being frequently counted among the O.T. apocrypha received by the Church.

the epistle itself was doubtful: "quoniam nisi sit Pauli, non perspicuum est canonicam esse." Erasmus went still farther, for he put the Epistle to the Hebrews on a par with the N.T. apocrypha, and stirred up again the old doubts respecting the Epistles of James, 2nd Peter, 2nd and 3rd John, and even the Apocalypse, on which account he incurred a severe censure from the Parisian Sorbonne. Hence it was only in accordance with the spirit of the time that the Council of Trent, in its fourth sitting, on the 8th April 1546, finally issued a *decretum de Canonicis Scripturis*, protected by its anathema, which enumerates the N. T. writings in the customary Latin manner: the four Gospels with the Acts of Luke, the fourteen Paulines with the Epistle to the Hebrews at the end, the seven epistles, in which those of Peter and John come first, while James and Jude are expressly termed Apostoli, and finally the Apocalypse. A proposal to distinguish between Homologumena and Antilegomena was decidedly rejected. How a New Testament science of Introduction on the basis of this decree could be developed in the Catholic Church we have already seen (§ 1, 2, 3).³ The necessity of making fixed regulations respecting the Canon was likewise felt in the Greek Church of the 17th century. Cyril Lucar in his *Confessio Christianæ Fidei*, of 1645, referred indeed to the Laodicean Synods for the number of the κανονικά βιβλία, but expressly named τοὺς τέσσαρας εὐαγγελιστὰς, τὰς πράξεις, τὰς ἐπιστολὰς μακαρίου Παύλου, καὶ τὰς καθολικὰς, αἷς συνάπτομεν καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν

³ A certain Antonius a Matre Dei still found it worth while, in his *Præludiva Isagogica* (Mogunt., 1670) to count up the *libri protocanonici* and *deuterocanonici* separately, although with the introductory remark that by virtue of the decree of Trent, their *fides* had become *æqua*. Among the former he reckons the four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Paulines 1 Peter and 1 John; among the latter the Epistle to the Hebrews, James and Jude, 2 Peter, 2nd and 3rd John and the Apocalypse, with the addition of some doubtful passages in the Text, such as the close of Mark's Gospel, the paragraph respecting the adulteress, and the words about the bloody sweat in Luke xxii.

τοῦ ἡγαπημένου; and in the year 1672 a council at Jerusalem, without enumerating the N.T. books, expressly decreed that those which by the synods and the oldest recognised Church Fathers were reckoned as such, even if not always accepted, or by all, must be included in the list.

6. It was Luther who first ventured on an entirely free criticism of the traditional Canon. This, however, was not historical but only dogmatic and in accordance with its whole aim directed to the kernel of evangelical doctrine. In the Epistle to the Hebrews he took offence at the rejection of a second repentance, in the Epistle of James at righteousness by works, in the Apocalypse at the incomprehensible visions, which did not apply to Christ and yet made such lofty pretensions, in the Epistle of Jude to the reference to sayings and narratives not contained in the Scriptures. That which he urges against them on other ground serves only to support his chief scruples. In saying that what does not teach Christ is not apostolic, even though taught by St. Paul and St. Peter, he distinctly lays down an entirely new dogmatic principle for the Canon, probably without being conscious of its range, or following out the question to its legitimate conclusion.¹ So too Zwingli at the religious conference in Berne (1528) rejected the Apocalypse as unbiblical, and, like Ecolampadius, asserted the right to make a distinction among the books of the Bible. On the other hand, Calvin insists on the apostolic authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, although ascribing it only to an

¹ He has nevertheless so far vindicated his dogmatic criticism as to separate those four books from the "true and certain chief books" of the Scriptures and put them at the end of his translation, under the pretext, that they formerly enjoyed a different reputation; which holds good of 2 Peter as well as of 2nd and 3rd John, but of the Apocalypse only in a certain sense. This arrangement has been retained in our editions of the Bible, in many of which only the first twenty-three are enumerated, just as in the first edition of Luther, while the four last are separated by a gap. In some editions printed in Low German they are directly designated as apocryphal.

apostolic disciple, and holds that the doubts with respect to the second Petrine Epistle do not suffice for its rejection. A true historical sense inspired the attempt of Andreas Bodenstein (Carlstadt), who, in his *Libellus de Canonicis Scripturis* (1520), divided the N. T. writings into three orders: *summæ dignitatis* (Gospels, probably including the Acts), *secundæ dign.* (thirteen Paulines, 1 Peter, 1 John), *tertîæ et infimæ auctoritatis* (the seven Antilegomena). We have only to compare it with the threefold division of Hugo a S. Victor (No. 5, note 1), of which it reminds us, in order to perceive the immense progress that was made. Even the Magdeburg Centuriators accept seven Antilegomena, from which they exclude Hebrews, James and Jude. Martin Chemnitz, in his *Examination Conc. Trid.*, expressly states that the later Church cannot make *certa* out of *dubiis*, unless she have the assured, positive and unanimous witness of the ancient Church, and calls the seven Antilegomena apocrypha in the sense of Jerome, because their origin is not certain and cannot be sufficiently established, so that, although useful for reading and for edification, they cannot be employed for the establishment of doctrine. This view prevailed among the Lutheran teachers of theology at the close of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century. But Johann Gerard no longer speaks of apocryphal books, but of *libri canonici secundi ordinis*; this, or *libri deutero-canonici*, being the name also given to them by Calovius, Quenstedt and Baier, as such, "de quorum auctoritate a quibusdam aliquando fuit dubitatum." But in proportion as it became usual to look upon these doubts as formerly existing but now settled, did all motive for such distinction disappear. It never passed over to the symbolical books; though the Lutherans never, like the Reformed (Gall., art. 3; Angl., art. 1; Belg., art. 4) expressly enumerate the canonical books. They felt that in this respect they were at one with the ancient Church, and required no definite

attestation of the fact. But the *Form. Conc.* clothes the conception of the Canon in a clear and definite formula: "Unam regulam et normam, secundum quam omnia dogmata omnesque doctores æstimari et judicari oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse quam prophetica et apostolica scripta V. et N.Ti."

7. The proper criticism of the Canon began in the Evangelical Church with Semler (§ 2, 1). No doubt the criterion which he set up for the canonical as such, viz. universal utility, was just as dogmatic as that of Luther, though in quite a different sense. But inasmuch as the object of his researches was to prove that the traditional Canon was by no means what it was supposed to be, viz. a collection of holy, inspired, apostolic writings that had always been regarded as normative in the Church, it was an easy thing for this criticism to destroy the traditional idea of the Canon. Even our researches have abundantly confirmed the fact that the collection of N. T. writings which in the course of the second half of the 4th century became more and more fixed as canonical, was by no means, as already at that time believed, a collection of those writings regarded as sacred by the ancient Church, and that the reception of individual books into this Canon was in itself no guarantee of their apostolic origin, since very diverse motives contributed to its origin. Nor is it of any use to go back to the Eusebian distinction between Homologumena and Antilegomena, for we have seen how fluctuating this is, and how even in the sense of its author, it is by no means limited to our present N. T. Scriptures, for which reason we can only be thankful that this new human position did not restrain free inquiry in the Lutheran Church, as for a time it threatened to do. Historical research should rather seek with perfect freedom to settle the origin of each individual writing on the basis of external and internal evidence. The result of this examination will then first suffice to form

the foundation of a judgment with respect to the traditional Canon. But this judgment is equally dependent on the doctrinal construction of the conception of the Canon, that is to say, on the question whether such construction makes the criterion of *Canon* to consist in that which is genuinely apostolic, or in a wider sense memorials of apostolic times, attesting each individual writing before the tribunal of the religious consciousness of the ancient Church or of the present. Only so much is clear, that the criticism which makes Christianity as such emerge from the strife and gradual reconciliation of incompatible opposites, and finds in our New Testament nothing but memorials of a doctrinal, historical process continuing till beyond the middle of the second century, does away with the idea of a Canon in the proper sense of the word. Whatever claim this criticism may make to be the only historical one, there is no doubt that it too is dominated by a doctrinal view of the nature of primitive Christianity and the laws of its development, which in many cases it adapts to standards drawn from a later time, thus making an historical knowledge of them impossible. Historical research respecting the origin of individual writings must liberate itself from their assumptions, as well as from the traditional view of the Canon, and in particular ascertain by a more minute exegetical analysis the actual historical relations which these writings presuppose.

SECOND PART.

HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.

FIRST DIVISION.

THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

§ 13. THE APOSTLE PAUL.

[Hemsen, *der Apostel Paulus*, Göttingen, 1830. Schrader, *der Apostel Paulus*, Leipzig, 1830. Baur, *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*, 1845 (2 Aufl. ed. Zeller), Tübingen, 1866. Hausrath, *der Apostel Paulus*, Heidelberg, 1865 (2 Aufl. 1872). Renan, *Paulus*, Autorisirte deutsche Ausgabe, Leipzig, 1869. Krenkel, *Paulus, der Apostel der Heiden*, Leipzig, 1869. Luthardt, *der Apostel Paulus*, Leipzig, 1869. Sabatier, *l'Apôtre Paul*, Strasbourg, 1870.]

1. TARSUS, situated at the outlet of the Taurus pass which leads down from Central Asia to the shores of the Mediterranean, was a populous town on the river Cydnus, which drove a flourishing trade, and received from Augustus the rank of a metropolis of Cilicia. It possessed autonomy though of a limited kind, and various privileges. The essentially Hellenic character of its citizens had created an interest in philosophical pursuits, and given rise to important seminaries which vied with Athens and Alexandria. The ancestors of the Apostle, who traced back their descent to the tribe of Benjamin (Rom. xi. 1), belonged to the Jewish community settled in this place from the time of the Seleucidæ. The Apostle at his legal circumcision on the eighth day received the name of Saul, "the prayed for"

(Σαῦλος), perhaps as a late-born, long-desired son. His father, who, like his ancestors, possessed the rights of a Roman citizen (Acts xxii. 28), belonged to the Pharisees (Acts xxiii. 6); hence the son was undoubtedly brought up in the strict principles of this party (Phil. iii. 5), remaining true to his mother-tongue, which according to Acts xxi. 40 he spoke with fluency.¹ For this reason, all contact with the Hellenic culture of his native town is out of the question. Moreover it is probable that he went early to Jerusalem (Acts xxvi. 4), where he had a married sister (Acts xxiii. 16), since it was intended that he should be educated there as a rabbi; but not without first learning the trade that was to maintain him during his course of teaching. The profession of a tent-maker (Acts xviii. 3, σκηνοποιός), i.e. of a manufacturer of the goat's hair cloth that served as a covering for tents, points to Cilicia, where this was a special industry. He was never married (1 Cor. vii. 7). He does not appear to have been of particularly strong bodily constitution,² in keeping with which, we have the fact that his

¹ The statement of Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.*, 5), recently treated by Krenkel as historical, that Paul was born at Gischala in Galilee, and only emigrated with his parents to Tarsus after the conquest of the town by the Romans, is an obvious error, since Gischala was first conquered by the Romans in the Jewish war under Titus (Joseph., *Bell. Jud.*, iv. 2, 1, etc.), and according to Jerome on Philemon 23, probably rests on a false interpretation of Phil. iii. 5, where the Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων applies only to his true Jewish descent (comp. also 2 Cor. xi. 22), so that not even his mother was a proselyte. Acts xxii. 3 (comp. ix. 11, xxi. 39) is decisive against it. The Roman citizenship of the Apostle has been questioned by Renan, Hausrath, etc., without any ground.

² In Gal. iv. 13 we find him hampered by infirmity; again we hear of a severe bodily affliction that tormented him (2 Cor. xii. 7); and although he was able to endure the fatigues of his wandering life, the exertions of his trade which frequently compelled him to take the night for his handicraft, besides many severe hardships (comp. 2 Cor. xi.), yet he felt keenly the weakness and feebleness of his body (2 Cor. iv. 7, 16), and at all events had the consciousness of being an old man at a comparatively early age (Philem. 9). The suffering in 2 Cor. xii. 7 has indeed been supposed to refer to fits of epilepsy, which have been made the explana-

presence was characterized by a certain timidity, which might easily be construed as weakness (1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. x. 10).

2. Saul owed his knowledge of the Scriptures as well as his method of interpretation, his dialectic as well as his Pharisaic orthodoxy, to the Rabbinical school at Jerusalem. According to Acts xxii. 3, Gamaliel, the grandson of Hillel, so highly lauded in the Mishna, was his special teacher. But whatever may be the case with regard to the much-vaunted mildness and liberality of this scholar, which however does not exactly appear in his counsel (Acts v. 34-39), in any case they had no influence on his pupil, who by his own confession excelled all his contemporaries in Pharisaic zeal (Gal. i. 14). He thus belonged to those to whom the fulfilment of the law, as required by the party, was a sacred obligation, and he was able to boast that, according to a Pharisaic standard, he was in this respect blameless (Phil. iii. 6). Nevertheless, all his efforts to gain favour with God by this means did not satisfy him. In constant strife with his own opposing nature, he only became more and more deeply entangled in the unhappy struggle between the desire to do better and the impotence of the natural man, which led him utterly to despair of his own salvation (Rom. vii. 11-24). The disturbance at Jerusalem due to the appearance of Stephen must have originated at the time of this mental struggle, when the Pharisaic party and the leaders of the people became apprehensive lest the Nazarene sect, hitherto tolerated on account of its fidelity to the law and even esteemed, should as a final result threaten the sanctuaries of Israel and the existence of the theocracy.¹

tion of his visions and states of ecstasy (2 Cor. xii. 1, etc.); but the connection in which Paul speaks of this suffering, which is to keep him from self-exaltation on account of his exalted revelations, absolutely excludes this interpretation.

¹ Whether Paul was present in Jerusalem during the time of the public ministry of Jesus, we do not know; in any case, it does not fol-

The unappeased desire to win the Divine favour and by this means internal peace, by increased zeal for the law of his fathers, made him a fanatical persecutor of the Christians (Acts viii. 3; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9; Phil. iii. 6). But on a journey to Damascus, which had for its object the persecution of the Christians, undertaken with the full authority of the Sanhedrim, he was convinced of the ungodliness of his former conduct by a vision of the exalted Christ, was converted to faith in Him, and was baptized by Ananias at Damascus (Acts ix. 1-19; comp. Gal. i. 13-16).²

All attempts to show the probability of a gradual psychological preparation for this sudden change, due to the freer tendency of his teacher Gamaliel, the Scriptural arguments of the Nazarenes, or the impression

low from 2 Cor. v. 16 that he saw Him, and he certainly received no impression of Him worth naming. On the other hand, he may have belonged to the members of the Cilician synagogue, who disputed much with Stephen (Acts vi. 9), and, according to Acts vii. 58, viii. 1, he looked on with approval at the stoning of Stephen. The expression *νεανίας* applied to him at that time, can only refer to a young man in the bloom of his youth, since he is represented by the Acts themselves as immediately afterwards vigorously at work (viii. 3), and even as a confidential messenger of the Sanhedrim (ix. 1; but comp. § 50, 3).

² When in Gal. i. 16 Paul says that after his conversion he sought no human counsel, it does not follow that he was not baptized by Ananias. On the contrary, when he traces back the revelation he received to the *καλέσας (με) διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*, the calling, in accordance with the constant diction of the Apostle, is nothing but the calling to the Church by means of awakening faith; but reception into the Church can only be accomplished through baptism. Luke repeatedly heard the Apostle describe the vision that was imparted to him (Acts xxii. 26), and has himself given a representation of it in accordance with this (ix. 3-8); but even apart from these free representations that are not entirely reconcilable, they prove nothing certain as to the form in which the heavenly glory of the exalted Christ made itself perceptible to his senses. Comp. Bengel, *die Bekehrung des Apostel Paulus*, Tübing., 1827; Greve, *die Bekehrung Pauli*, Gütersloh, 1848; Paret, in *der Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1859, 2; Holsten and Hilgenfeld, in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1861, 3; 1864, 2 (comp. Holsten, *zum Evangelium des Petrus und Paulus*, Rostock, 1868); Beyschlag, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1864, 2; 1870, 1, 2; Diestelmann, *das Jugendleben des Saulus, seine Bekehrung u. apostolische Berufung*, Hannover, 1866.

of the joyful death of Stephen and other martyrs, are destroyed by the Apostle's account in Gal. i., the obvious tendency of which is to support his assertion that he did not learn his gospel from man, but received it by revelation (i. 12), by proving in the first place that in his fanatical zeal for the law and persecution he was quite inaccessible to human influences of this kind, when God of His own free pleasure chose him for Himself in order to reveal His Son to him (i. 13-16); just as in Phil. iii. 12 he represents his conversion as *a being apprehended by Christ*. Such attempts moreover set out with the assumption that for a long time Paul resisted a better conviction that was forcing itself upon him, and drowned the voice of conscience by an ever-increasing rage of fanaticism, whereas notwithstanding his self-accusations (1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 13), he knows nothing of this, and, if 1 Tim. i. 13 be genuine, states the contrary. In particular, the idea is put forward, especially by the Tübingen school, that Paul, by reflection on the saving significance of the death on the cross, gradually came to acknowledge the Messiahship of Christ, just as the Christians endeavoured to prove the same thing from the fact that he too acknowledged the Scriptures, supporting their allegation by his admission of the possibility of the resurrection, and maintaining that full conviction came to him in a vision that had arisen psychologically. But the question of the Messiahship of Christ was not in his view one of theological doctrine, but one of religious life; by the recognition of which his whole former life, and the means by which he had most certainly hoped to win God's favour were condemned as foolishness and sin. Hence it is impossible that the unalterable certainty which reversed all his former preconceptions could have been based on intellectual reflection; in the case of others he never attributed it to this but solely to Divine efficacy (1 Cor. ii. 4 f.). In any case, the vision which established this certainty in him must be attributed to direct Divine agency; to him it meant an actual conviction of the Divine glory, and hence of the Messiahship of the Crucified One, whose resurrection had been announced by His disciples; for which reason all his former preconceptions were destroyed. But Paul does not put the vision of Christ that had been imparted to him, and to which he appeals as the ground of his apostleship, on a level with the visions and revelations of which he unwillingly boasts (2 Cor. xii.); he looks on it as the last in the series of appearances vouchsafed by the Risen One to His former disciples (1 Cor. xv. 8), while visions were of constant recurrence in the Church as long as the gracious gifts of the primitive time retained their efficacy. The fact that Gal. i. 16 speaks of a revelation of the Son of God *in him*, proves so little against a sensuous appearance, that without it, on the contrary, this could never have been recognised for what it was in its full meaning, nor assured against all suspicion of having been an illusion of the senses.

So powerful was the inner change which Saul passed through that he retired for nearly three years to Arabia, *i.e.* probably to the northern part of it, to Hauran (Auranitis) bordering on Syria, in order in the loneliness of the desert, in contemplation and prayer, to learn the meaning of what he had experienced. That he exercised a missionary activity there, is neither indicated by the context of Gal. i. 17, which only excludes all thought of his having discussed his experiences with men or received from them any explanation of saving truth, nor do we elsewhere find any trace of it (not even in Rom. xv. 19). It is certain that he afterwards associated his wonderful conversion with the Divine intention to make him an apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. i. 15 f.), and therefore when referring to the grace that had been specially bestowed on him, had always both in his mind; but it by no means follows that this was clear to him from the beginning.³ It was, moreover, easy to understand that being of so energetic a nature, he felt constrained to work as actively in promoting the new faith as formerly in opposing it. But for this very reason it was incumbent on him to carry out the entire change of his religious views in solitude and intercourse with his God, whose ulterior revelations he there sought and found, a change which was the necessary consequence of his conversion to Christ, though it must not be assumed that he had already evolved his whole doctrinal system in this place.

3. It is altogether credible that Saul when he returned from the Arabian desert to Damascus (Gal. i. 17), and was driven thence by snares on the part of the Ethnarch of King Aretas, who governed there (2 Cor. xi. 32 f.), had brought

³ Even the Acts make the Apostle speak later as if a revelation respecting his destination as an apostle to the Gentiles had been already imparted to him at the time of his conversion (xxvi. 16); but in xxii. 11 they transfer it to Jerusalem; and in ix. 15 represent it as having been imparted only to Ananias.

this upon himself by the announcement of Jesus' Messiahship among the Jews of that place (Acts ix. 20-25). It would remain completely inconceivable how the Ethnarch should have advanced to this hostility against him, if he had not been denounced to him as a disturber of the peace by the Jews who wished to set aside the preacher of heretical doctrine (ix. 23). The opinion that he there adduced Scriptural proof of the Messiahship of Jesus other than what he had often heard from believers, is altogether unhistorical, and is refuted by Gal. i. 23, which does not however exclude the possibility of his having from the beginning, on the basis of his experience, preached the sending of the Messiah as an act of Divine grace for the deliverance of sinners, and the sending of the Spirit as the means which made the appropriation of salvation possible to the individual.

It is certain that the acquaintance of the Acts with these beginnings of Saul is inaccurate, since they know nothing of his three years' sojourn in Arabia, and therefore make his short ministry in Damascus, to which the enmity of the Jews soon put an end, follow immediately on his conversion. We must not therefore make this activity begin before the journey to Arabia on account of the *εὐθέως* in Acts ix. 20, for the *εὐθέως* in Gal. i. 16 is decisive against it; nor must we reckon as belonging to this activity, contrary to Acts ix. 19, 23, the greater part of the three years mentioned in Gal. i. 18. It is usual to make the computation of the year of his conversion dependent on a consideration of the time when Damascus might have been under Arabian supremacy. It is assumed that Aretas during the war with Herod Antipas, when Vitellius had led his troops into winter quarters after hearing of the death of Tiberius († 37), took possession of the rich commercial city and held it till the new arrangement of Arabian affairs by Caligula (circ. 38) so that the driving away of Paul took place about 38 (three years after his conversion). Others, however, are of opinion that Aretas only held the city for a short time while this new arrangement was taking place, since we have no Roman coins from Damascus of the time of Caligula and Claudius, such as we possess of the time of Augustus and Tiberius, so that no certain data for a computation remain, and we only know that the conversion cannot have taken place *before* the year 35. Others again doubt whether the time when Damascus was held by Arab princes, even though under Roman supremacy, can be fixed with any certainty; and according to Mommsen, Damascus remained always dependent on the

Roman empire. Comp. K uchler, *de anno quo Paulus ad sacra christiana conversus est*, Leip., 1828. Anger, *de temp. in Actis Apost. ratione*, Leip., 1833. Wieseler, *Chronologie des apost. Zeitalters*, G tting., 1848. Keim in Schenkel's *Bibelles.*, i., 1869.

Though Paul's object in repairing from Damascus to Jerusalem was to make the acquaintance of Peter, yet the fact that he remained there for a period of fifteen days (Gal. i. 18) shows that intercourse with Peter could not possibly have been his sole occupation; therefore it is very likely that he availed himself of the opportunity to dispute with the Hellenists, till their deadly enmity compelled him to take his departure (Acts ix. 29). But the account in the Galatian Epistle does not by any means exclude the supposition that after he had carried out the design of visiting Peter at Jerusalem he might gladly have continued there for a longer time if other circumstances had not hindered him.¹

¹ All that the Apostle has in view is to show the length of time that elapsed before he went to Jerusalem, and that his object in going was not to ask counsel of Peter; also that the time he passed there was in no way connected with the three years during which his Christianity had already matured. Therefore though it is certain that at that time he had not yet learnt his peculiar gospel of salvation (Gal. i. 12), since the actual meaning of the death and resurrection of Christ was made known to him by direct revelation, it is equally certain that he then first asked and was told by Peter many things respecting the Lord's life on earth (comp. Paret, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1858, 1). The only respect in which the account of the Acts is inaccurate is in not knowing that among the authorities in Jerusalem, Paul only at that time made acquaintance with James the brother of the Lord; whereas it takes for granted that he had intercourse there with all the primitive apostles (ix. 28). The account here given, that when the Church drew back timidly from the former persecutor, he was introduced to the apostles by Barnabas (ix. 26 f.), is not contained in the Galatian Epistle, which had of course no motive for mentioning this very natural circumstance that had nothing whatever to do with his apostolic independence. That he preached in Jerusalem and Damascus is moreover confirmed by Gal. i. 22 f., apart from Rom. xv. 29. For these verses taken in connection can only prove that because on leaving Jerusalem he went directly to Syria and Cilicia, he remained unknown to the (other) Churches of Judea even by sight, to say nothing of the impossibility of his having been taught by one of the other apostles presumably working among these

At all events, in the experiences he made at Jerusalem, he perceived an indication that a field of activity was not assigned to him in the place where his former persecuting zeal had been exercised (comp. Acts xxii. 17, 21); and therefore he went back through Syria to his Cilician home (Gal. i. 21; Acts ix. 30). There, probably in his native town of Tarsus, Paul remained for a long term of years, during which we hear nothing of him. But from the ardour with which he embraced the new faith, it may be supposed that he would not be inactive even here. From the fervent love he bore his fellow-countrymen and his concern for their salvation (Rom. ix. 2 f., x. 1), as well as his conviction that salvation was destined first for them (Rom. i. 16, xi. 17) he would naturally labour above all for their conversion, especially as no direct sign from God pointed him to the heathen. It is true that even here, according to Acts xi. 25, it must have appeared that he possessed a peculiar aptitude for bringing the Gospel to the heathen also. But the assumption often made, that he employed this time in preparing himself for a ministry among them by means of the educational institutions of his ancestral city, is excluded by his own express declaration in 1 Cor. ii. 1-5. He was and remained an *ιδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ* (2 Cor. xi. 6) and had acquired his relative facility in the use of Greek and his acquaintance with the Greek spirit and life only in intercourse with Greeks, not from books.² Certainly the Churches in Syria and Cilicia men-

Churches. On the contrary they heard with gratitude to God that he now preached the gospel he had formerly persecuted and therefore required no instruction in it. It is in accordance neither with context nor wording to make this apply to his ministry in Cilicia and Syria. There was as little reason for mentioning his preaching in Damascus and Jerusalem as for mentioning in i. 21 his residence in Syria and Cilicia.

² All that was written in earlier times *de stupenda eruditione Pauli* (Schramm; Herborn, 1710) and later respecting his acquaintance with Demosthenes, Köster, *Stud. und Krit.*, 1854), is pure fancy. The saying of his countryman Aratus of Cilicia (Acts xvii. 28), appears also in other writers, and is expressly quoted as a poetical saying in frequent use; the

tioned in Acts xv. 24, 41 are partly the fruit of these years; but it is clear even from the former passage that they were mixed Churches which stood in close connection with Jerusalem, and cannot be looked upon as the creations of Paul peculiarly and exclusively.

4. *Antioch*, the chief city of the province of Syria and the residence of imperial legates, picturesquely situated in the fruitful plain of the Orontes, had expanded under the Romans into a world-renowned city, in which oriental luxury coalesced with Greek art and culture, and Greek mythology with the cults of the East. The numerous Jews settled there, who already under the Seleucidæ enjoyed great freedom and had their own Ethnarchs, possessed a synagogue richly furnished with treasure, and gained numerous proselytes from among the heathen (comp. Acts vi. 5, Nicolaus). Members of the Church in Jerusalem, scattered by persecution, had preached the gospel there among the Jews, until some Hellenists among them from Cyprus and Cyrene also attached themselves to the Hellenic population, to whom they gained access with surprising facility. Barnabas of Cyprus brought about a union between the Church of this place, which thus acquired a powerful heathen-Christian element, and the mother Church at Jerusalem, and he it was who brought Saul, with whom he had already been on friendly terms at Jerusalem, from Tarsus, in order to share in the promising harvest among the Gentiles (Acts xi. 19-25). Specially fitted, as a Hellenist, for the work, the experience of his own life taught him to proclaim the exalted Divine Lord as the mediator of salvation to all lost sinners; but Barnabas must also have been led to the conclusion that

declaration of Epimenides of Crete respecting his countrymen (Tit. i. 12) was in the island naturally in every mouth; and in 1 Cor. xv. 33, a verse from the Thais of Menander is given in a form in which the metre is destroyed, so that it is only regarded as a *locus communis*. Paul refused on principle to weaken the Divine power of the Gospel by mixing it with human wisdom and rhetoric (1 Cor. ii. 1 f., 4 f.).

this was the right place for him, from what he heard of his former efficiency. As a matter of fact the first year that he passed here working together with Barnabas, at once became very fruitful for the spread of Christianity, since the name of Christian was here first applied by the heathen to believers who could no longer be regarded as a Jewish sect, because they consisted for the most part of former heathen whose faith in the Messiah of Israel was by no means associated with the acceptance of circumcision and the legal customs of that nation (xi. 26).¹ Evidence of the close communion that continued to exist between this and the mother Church at Jerusalem is afforded by the collection which the former sent to the latter when Agabus foretold a dearth by which Palestine was visited under Claudius (xi. 27, 30).

According to Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, Saul in company with Barnabas was the bearer of this collection. This might have been simply an erroneous conception on the part of the Acts; and Saul might not have made the journey at all, or at least not have gone as far as Jerusalem. But the current opinion that here the Acts are at variance with the Galatian Epistle, overlooks the fact that only in Gal. i. where Paul asserts that he did not receive his gospel from man, was it important to show how late he came to Jerusalem, and how after a short sojourn in that place where he became acquainted with Peter and James, he withdrew entirely from the sphere of the Jewish Churches where he might have come into contact with the primitive apostles. On the other hand, as soon as it is mentioned in i. 23 that he himself appeared as a preacher of the gospel, thus excluding the idea of his having received instruction in it, all interest in counting up his later visits to Jerusalem falls away. The time of the journey, as stated in ii. 1 f., merely suggests the consider-

¹ Lipsius (*über den Ursprung und ältesten Gebrauch des Christennamens*, Jena, 1873) has convincingly proved that the name was given to Christians by the heathen, and that it originated among Greek-speaking people, so that the scruples of Baur and others with respect to the historical character of this account, are set aside. In Nero's time it was already current in Rome (Tacitus, *Ann.*, 15, 44) "quos vulgus christianos appellat," comp. Suetonius, Nero, 15); and if it does not appear in the writings of Paul, it only follows from this that the Christians had not appropriated it to themselves (comp. also 1 Pet. iv. 16).

ation that it was not until fourteen years after the beginning of his independent activity that he had felt it necessary to lay his gospel before the authorities in Jerusalem. That during the course of these years he once visited Jerusalem with another object is not excluded thereby. If then his first visit to Jerusalem was somewhere in the year 38 (comp. No. 3), some six years would have elapsed, in which he had not repaired to the city, but had worked independently in Cilicia, with the exception of a year in Antioch (Acts xi. 26), when the famine which the prophet Agabus had predicted lay heavy on Judea, in the year 44 as is generally assumed.³

The idea of a formal missionary journey first arose in the Church at Antioch. Barnabas and Saul were expressly selected for that purpose, from among the many prophets who were active in the Church, and were sent forth with prayer and the imposition of hands (xiii. 1-3). John Mark, whom his cousin Barnabas had brought from Jerusalem to Antioch, was taken with them as an assistant, but appears soon to have lost heart and returned to Perga, whence it was intended to penetrate deeper into Asia (xii. 25, xiii. 5, 13). The missionaries went first to the house of Barnabas, to Cyprus, where they already hoped according to xi. 19, to find openings; they travelled through the whole island from Salamis to Paphos, and gained over to the faith the Roman proconsul Sergius Paulus (xiii. 4-12). Thence they sailed to the opposite coast of Pamphylia and up the mouth of the Cestrus to the town of Perga, whence they travelled to Antioch in Pisidia where they appear to have had a longer

³ The Acts also appear to assume this, since they obviously presuppose that the deputies only departed from Jerusalem after the death of Herod Agrippa, who died in the year 44, soon after the passover, having previously put James the son of Zebedee to death and imprisoned Peter (Acts xii. 25). It must not, however, be left out of account, that the arrangement of events according to which the resolution to undertake the missionary journey immediately follows the collection journey, in which the messengers had experienced the acme of Jewish enmity against Christianity, is conditioned by the pragmatism of the Acts (§ 50, 3), and that the Palestinian famine under Claudius probably happened several years later (comp. Keim, *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, Zürich, 1878), so that Saul's ministry in Cilicia extends over several years.

term of work, till the persecution of the Jews drove them away to Lycaonia (xiii. 13-52).³ Here they laboured in Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, but at the farthest accessible point eastward they were already near the borders of Cilicia, where they turned aside in order to strengthen and organize the newly-founded Churches, going back to Perga where they appear to have remained longer on this occasion, and finally down to the sea-coast, where they took ship from Attalia to Antioch (Acts xiv.).⁴

³ When Galatia became a Roman province after the death of Amyntas, who by the favour of Augustus united important parts of the neighbouring provinces under his dominion (25 B.C.), Pisidia and large portions of Lycaonia, particularly the cities of Lystra, Derbe, and probably Iconium, were attached to this province. Upon this is founded the hypothesis of Mynster (*Einkl. in d. Brief an die Galater*, in his *Kleine Theologischen Schriften*, Copenhagen, 1825, comp. Niemeier, *de temp.—ep. ad Gal.*, Göttingen, 1827), that the Galatian Churches to which Paul afterwards wrote, were those founded on this journey. This hypothesis found at that time much assent and was again renewed by Renan, Haus-rath, Weizsäcker (*Jahrb. f. d. Theol.*, 1876), Wendt, Schenkel and others. But the name of Galatia, as applied to a portion of land legally joined to a province, was never generally adopted; the Acts undoubtedly make a distinction between the Γαλατικὴ χώρα (xvi. 6, xviii. 23) and the provinces here named. There were in fact already Churches in Galatia proper (xviii. 23), at the time when Paul wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, and it is absolutely inconceivable that he should notwithstanding have addressed inhabitants of these provinces as Γαλάται (Gal. iii. 1), simply because they too legally belonged to the province of Galatia. Compare Siefert (in Meyer's *Comm. z. Galaterbrief*, 1880) and Holsten (*Das Evangelium des Paulus*, Berlin, 1880).

⁴ The length of this journey cannot be accurately determined, since the Acts in reality only hint at a longer residence in Antioch, and give a bare sketch of everything else that occurred down to the conflict with Elymas in Paphos (xii. 6-12) and the events in Lystra (xiv. 8-20), for which moreover they fix no time. How many of the troubles, sufferings and dangers recorded in 2 Cor. xi., may have happened on the journey, although the Acts do not notice them! And whether this journey immediately followed the return from Jerusalem remains entirely doubtful, since the close connection in which the missionary journey appears to stand with Israel's hardening, which had manifestly reached its climax in chap. xii., belongs perhaps to the pragmatism of the narrator (comp. note 2).

5. For Saul of Tarsus, this journey was in many ways a decisive turning-point. Having been taken to Jerusalem by Barnabas, called by him to Antioch, and with him been appointed a deputy of the Church in the matter of the collection, he undoubtedly undertook the journey only in conjunction with Barnabas, who in accordance with his whole position in the Church at Antioch was the actual leader of the missionary enterprise, which was also directed in the first instance towards his home. It is obviously the intention of the Acts to indicate this by always naming Barnabas before Saul in the beginning of the journey (xiii. 2, 7). Only after the great success of Saul in Paphos is there a change in this respect (xiii. 13, *οἱ περὶ Παύλον*), Paul being now just as consistently put forward (xiii. 43, 46, 50).¹ It is Paul who preaches in Antioch, whose healing of the lame man at Lystra calls forth the complications in that place; doubtless it became apparent on this journey that Paul was the man specially adapted for proper missionary preaching and efficient work among unbelievers, while Barnabas was better fitted for the consolation of new converts (iv. 36). The plan of the mission, in accordance with which a series of Churches was founded throughout the whole south-east of Asia Minor, reaching out a hand across the Taurus to the Churches of Cilicia, as they did to the Syrian Churches, which again were the connecting medium with those of Judea, was manifestly his work. In these successful results of his activity and in the special gift for founding Churches, Paul saw afterwards the peculiar distinguishing mark and the Divine attestation of his apostleship (1 Cor. iii. 10, ix. 1 f.; 2 Cor. iii. 2; Rom. xv. 20). The peculiar position which Jesus Himself

¹ The only exception (xiv. 14) is manifestly conditioned by the circumstance that the people of Lystra take Barnabas for Zeus, Paul only for Hermes; and yet this too shows that the former was indeed the imposing presence, but the latter the proper spokesman of the mission (bat comp. § 50, 8, note 1).

gave to the Twelve in the Church, Paul could only trace back *ex eventu* to the circumstance that He had chosen and trained them to be its first founders (comp. Matt. xvi. 18); and if they had had the privilege of intercourse with Jesus, he too, like them, had been counted worthy of a manifestation of the Risen and Exalted One (1 Cor. xv. 8, ix. 1). The fact that he felt himself equally privileged with them notwithstanding the consciousness of his unworthiness (1 Cor. xv. 9), and claimed to be the same as they, the Divine miraculous aid which attested itself in his *σημεία*, could only be a sign that he was no false apostle (2 Cor. xii. 12). Thus it was this journey from which he returned with the ripe consciousness of his apostolic calling and destination.²

6. The Acts do not by any means say that Barnabas and Saul were sent out on a mission to the heathen; it appears rather that their immediate object had reference to the Jewish Diaspora, whereby an incidental preaching of the Gospel to the heathen, resulting in their conversion, is as little excluded as it had been in Antioch itself. At Cyprus we hear only of preaching in the synagogues (xiii. 5); even the Roman proconsul, over whom the Jewish sorcerer possessed so great an influence, and who seems to have been predisposed in favour of the gospel (xiii. 7), must already have approached Judaism. The experiences in Pisidian Antioch are obviously given with such minuteness, in order to show how Paul's preaching in the synagogue attracted even the heathen, and how jealousy of their crowding in entirely

² The Acts indeed speak of Paul and Barnabas as *ἀπόστολοι* (xiv. 4, 14), but apart from the fact that they were both delegates of the Church at Antioch (comp. 2 Cor. viii. 23) and that the name therefore is not yet necessarily employed in a technical sense, Paul too on one occasion included his companions and assistants in the name *Apostle*, and also counted other prominent authorities of the Church, as in a certain sense apostles (Gal. i. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 7). But on this journey he became conscious of his specific gift in direct contrast with Barnabas, by virtue of which he felt himself to be an apostle.

closed the hearts of the Jews against him. On this occasion Paul for the first time told them that their rejection of the gospel compelled him to turn to the Gentiles who received his word joyfully, and for the first time the fanatical enmity of the Jews put an end to the ministry of the missionaries in that place (xiii. 44-50). Yet the activity in Iconium again begins with preaching in the synagogue, which was accepted with faith by Jews and Hellenes; but again the Jews stirred up the population against the preachers and compelled them to give way (xiv. 1-6). The healing of a lame man in Lystra inspired the Gentiles with enthusiasm for them, and it was only the agitation of the Jews who had crept in from Antioch and Iconium that led to a change (xiv. 11-19).¹ It must have been experiences of this nature that gave rise to the view in the Apostle's mind, that the Jewish want of faith in the gospel led to their rejection and the calling of the Gentiles in their place, as well as to the salvation of the latter through Divine mercy (Rom. xi. 11, 17 ff., 30 f.). By virtue of his religious perception he could see nothing but the verification of a Divine plan of salvation in what he actually experienced. If the increasing enmity of the Jews to the gospel compelled him more and more to turn his ministry to the Gentile world, which met him with surprising susceptibility, he only regarded this as a manifestation of the Divine purpose to take the gospel from the Jews for whom it was first intended, and to give it to the Gentiles.

¹ It is certainly consistent with the whole plan of the Acts that these relations are so copiously presented in the communications respecting the journey which are elsewhere so scanty, but it is an entirely unjustifiable assertion of the Tübingen school that this representation is unhistorical. Notwithstanding the motives that predisposed the Apostle to take the gospel first of all to his fellow-countrymen (No. 3), yet the synagogue offered the natural and only starting-point for all activity in heathen lands. It even appears that all the Churches founded in Asia Minor still contained a strong Jewish element, having been organized on the model of the synagogue (xiv. 23); but the heathen element must everywhere have preponderated.

And if it were he who was appointed to carry out this Divine intention, it was natural, after the experiences he had already made during his ministry in Cilicia and Syrian Antioch, that he should become more and more convinced that he was specially called, in distinction from the other apostles, to be the apostle of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 13, comp. i. 5, xv. 16), and that the miracle of his conversion was from the beginning directed to this object (Gal. i. 16).

7. The fact that Saul now received the name of Paul, by which he invariably calls himself in his epistles, is obviously in keeping with the epoch-making importance of this journey. We have an intimation of this also in the Acts, where from the beginning as far as xiii. 7 he is always called Saul, and then, after the designation Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος has been given to him in xiii. 9, and from xiv. 13 is as constantly called by the name of Paul. But this change of name has obviously nothing whatever to do with the events there narrated, even in the opinion of the narrator.¹ Since Barnabas and Saul, who according to xiii. 1 f. were set apart for the missionary journey, were named in the former way among the prophets in the Church, these names must also have been used where the messengers are mentioned by name for the first time (xiii. 7). But when a transition is made to the new names in what follows, where Paul first appears as the proper leader of the mission (No. 5, xiii. 9, 13), it is as clear as possible that he began to bear the name on this journey in proportion as his peculiar ministry opened out. It evidently seemed to him to be better adapted to

¹ The opinion that he adopted this name from the proconsul Sergius Paulus who had been converted by him (Hieron., *de Vir. Ill.*, 5), although still held by Meyer, Ewald and others, is quite untenable, and must not be ascribed, with Baur, to the author of the Acts, since they do not give him this name just after the event (xiii. 12). And it is entirely opposed to the mind of the Apostle to make the new name commemorative of his first manifestation of apostolic power on the person of Elymas, on which occasion he is first called by it.

his ministry in heathen lands, and the more conscious he became of his apostolic calling, so much the more did he employ this as his proper apostolic name. It does not follow that he first adopted it on this occasion, or that he Latinized his Hebrew name, a thing which the Acts would certainly have expressly indicated. The assumption also that he adopted it at his conversion, is entirely arbitrary, presupposing that he attached to it some meaning with reference to that event, which however cannot be proved. All inquiry into an explanation of the name is entirely fruitless. It is most probable that Saul bore the well-known Roman name Paul in addition to his Jewish one, as was very usual among Hellenistic Jews, especially as he possessed Roman citizenship (No. 1). Hitherto he had had no reason for laying aside his Jewish name, by which he was naturally still called in Jewish circles, whilst the use of the Roman one was more appropriate to his present ministry.

§ 14. PAUL AND THE PRIMITIVE APOSTLES.

1. Jesus had appeared in Israel, and on principle laboured for Israel exclusively. He wished to realize the kingdom of God, according to promise, among the chosen race, who were to participate in its salvation to the greatest extent. It is true that when the people became more and more hopelessly hardened, He had spoken of the passing over of salvation to other peoples, and of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple; but this prophetic threat might remain for ever unfulfilled, if the nation as such were to turn and be converted. Long since had Jesus referred to the great Jonah-sign of His resurrection, which once again would bring the nation and its leaders to a final decision. His apostles, whose destination was already indicated by the fact of their being twelve in number, were called to be witnesses of His resurrection, by the preaching of which

they were to bring the people to repentance, and to lead them to believe in the exalted Messiah.¹ They could have had no thought of a heathen mission for the very reason that, according to the prediction of the prophets, salvation was first of all to be accomplished in Israel, and only then were the nations, called by Jehovah, to come of their own accord to participate in it. To make the fulfilment of this promise possible, the primitive apostles laboured for the conversion of their own people (Acts ii. 38 f., iii. 19 ff., 25 f.). Nor did the mission to Israel appear by any means hopeless in the beginning. The fact that they adhered faithfully to the law of their fathers with the whole primitive Church, and even, as truly pious Israelites, sought to fulfil it with the most rigorous strictness, contributed essentially to this end. No word of Jesus had released them from the obligation to it under which they had been placed by circumcision, only that its fulfilment in the sense of the Master naturally differed in many respects from that inculcated by the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. v. 17, 20).² But even if by this means they acquired a freer moral attitude in certain points towards the letter of the law, yet there could be no question of a renunciation of the law where they were concerned, since they would thus have made a breach between themselves and their still unbelieving countrymen,

¹ Neither the oldest apostolic tradition of the Lord's words nor John's Gospel contains any command to the Twelve with respect to a Gentile mission; it is Mark who, in presence of the great extension of the Pauline Gentile mission, first introduced a prediction of it into a saying whose original acceptation shows nothing of it (xiii. 9 f.; comp. also xiv. 9). It is only the first Evangelist who makes the exalted Christ send the Twelve to all nations (Matt. xxviii. 18 f.), while the third makes the mission proceed from the risen Saviour (Luke xxiv. 17) at a time when by God's judgment on Israel their definite hardening was already decided.

² It is quite arbitrary to assume that, though expecting from their Messiah salvation and deliverance, they endeavoured to win it by this fulfilment of the law, whose insufficiency must have been just as clear to them, as true Israelites, as to the apostle Paul.

which would have rendered it impossible to influence them, and have destroyed all prospect of the ardently desired and still expected conversion of the whole nation.

2. It is a thoroughly erroneous idea that Stephen at least appeared in the primitive Church as the forerunner of Paul. The thing that excited the fanaticism of the unbelieving Jews against him, was simply his reiteration of Christ's threatening prophecy, according to which the continued hardening of the mass of the nation must lead to the destruction of the temple, and with it to the dissolution of the theocratic institutions of national life. Neither his appearing, nor the persecution to which it gave rise, which moreover soon exhausted itself in the impossible attempt to bring forward anything tenable against the believers in Christ, in any way altered the position of the primitive Church towards the law or the question of the mission. Their dispersion after the death of Stephen naturally contributed to the more rapid spread of the gospel in wider circles (Acts viii. 4); but even where preachers went abroad to Phœnicia, Cyprus, Syria or elsewhere among the Jewish Diaspora, their message was addressed to the Jews exclusively (xi. 19). There were already believing Jews in Damascus (ix. 2), and the conversion of Samaria (viii. 5-14), that lay still nearer to Jerusalem, had already been effected in connection with the founding of the Church in Galilee (ix. 31).¹ It is un-

¹ If the pragmatism of the Acts regards the martyrdom of Stephen and the persecution which followed, as well as the subsequent execution of James and imprisonment of Peter by Herod Agrippa, as the visible stages of an increasing hardening of the nation against the gospel, which in the Pauline sense was to pave the way according to God's decree for its passing over to the heathen, it obviously does not follow that this was the view of the primitive Church from the beginning. Such pragmatism has also determined the order of the different narratives (comp. § 13, 4, note 2, 4; § 50, 3, note 2), which therefore affords no guarantee that the conversion of Samaria only occurred after the death of Stephen, especially as the introduction of the source manifestly here reproduced (viii. 5) does not at all look as if Philip had come as a fugitive to

questionably an error to suppose that the activity of the primitive apostles was completely limited to Jerusalem, or at most to Judea. The fact that Paul on his first visit found Peter there alone (Gal. i. 19), can only be explained by assuming that many of them were already travelling about, as implied in 1 Cor. ix. 5. How easy it must have been for Jews of the Diaspora, who had been converted when visiting Jerusalem at their festivals, to induce some of them to carry the gospel to their countrymen outside; or other members of the primitive Church might in their commercial travels bear the seed of the gospel to the synagogues of the Diaspora. But this spread of the gospel was entirely incidental, and the Acts are right in representing the organized missionary journey of Barnabas and Saul as an epoch-making event. As Jesus Himself had already come in contact with individual Gentiles, it would have been very surprising if a like thing had not early happened to the primitive apostles; and that such was the fact is shown by the narratives respecting the Ethiopian eunuch and the centurion Cornelius.² As the primitive Church in the latter

Samaria from Jerusalem. Though the conversion of the half-heathen Samaria forms in the Acts the first step to a Gentile mission, the primitive Church did not certainly look upon it in that light, since Jesus Himself had already worked successfully there (John iv. 40 ff.), and had by His judgment respecting the Samaritans prevented the primitive Church from regarding these children of Jacob (John iv. 12) as shut out from the salvation of Israel.

² Since the two narratives of Philip contained in Acts viii. are only connected together in the interest of pragmatism, and viii. 26 proves plainly that Philip was not at that time a fugitive, it is by no means certain that the baptism of the treasurer is subsequent to the Stephen-catastrophe; and the story of Cornelius in Acts x., according to xv. 7 undoubtedly belongs to an earlier date (comp. § 50, 3, note 2). But it is impossible that the author of the Acts could intend by this story to make Peter the apostle of the Gentiles; since in ix. 15 he expressly represents Paul as having been called for this purpose, describes Cornelius himself as a proselyte of the gate (x. 2), and only in xi. 20 gives such prominence to the beginning of the preaching of the gospel to the Greeks at Antioch. But in truth the narrative furnishes no presumption

case was convinced that God called individual Gentiles to salvation by unmistakable indications, before the conversion of all Israel, giving them repentance unto life (xi. 18), so in like manner it was doubtless taken as a matter of course when the knowledge of the Gentile conversion in Antioch came to Jerusalem (xi. 22), the epoch-making significance of which is made so prominent by the Acts, for the reason that nothing is related of a Gentile-apostolic ministry of Paul in Syria and Cilicia (and justly so, comp. § 13, 3). As a matter of fact the first baptisms of Gentiles took place without the question having even been mooted as to whether they should be made to pass over to Judaism by means of circumcision and the law. There were now, even in the believing Church of the Messiah, uncircumcised persons who did not live according to the legal manner of the Jews, but these always remained exceptions, to whom an exceptional position may have been willingly granted.³

3. The question took quite another form in consequence of the great missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas. In it a series of predominantly Gentile Christian Churches was founded; but even here the experiences, on the ground of

whatever to justify the Gentile mission or to make it obligatory, since Peter was compelled by Divine directions quite exceptional, to preach the gospel to Cornelius, nor even in favour of the baptism of believing Gentiles, since the pouring out of the Spirit preceded it in the case of Cornelius (comp. x. 47). Nor was it either of these that aroused suspicion in the primitive Church, but solely that Peter went in to the uncircumcised and ate with them, a thing which he dared not do as a Jew faithful to the law (xi. 3). We see from this why the primitive apostles could have had no idea of a heathen mission (comp. No. 1).

³ Yet the hope was always entertained of the entire conversion of Israel in the immediate future, in consequence of which the Messiah would return to complete the kingdom of God. If then all peoples were to come to the salvation realized in Israel according to the prediction of the prophets, it was reserved for the Messiah to regulate the principle of life-association between them and the Jews, either by the heathen attaching themselves in a body to the theocracy of Israel and its ordinances; or by laying down under Divine direction rules of life entirely new, in the completed kingdom of God.

which this had been effected, excluded all idea of demanding from the Gentiles who received the gospel a previous acceptance of Judaism.¹ These things were naturally regarded under a different aspect in the primitive Church. But the reception of an uncircumcised person into the Church was no longer an isolated and exceptional case; a large Church of Gentile Christians began to be formed, surpassing the primitive Church in numbers and extent, and therefore necessarily of greater importance for the development of the Church of the Messiah, whose members moreover lived under different arrangements. The time in fact seemed now to have arrived when the former exceptional position of the Gentile Christians was to cease, and their relation to the believing Jews to be regulated in accordance with new principles. But since there could be no thought of a change of legal ordinances where the latter were concerned, so long as no Divine intimation released them from the obligation imposed on them by circumcision, and so long as the conversion of Israel, to which such intimation would have been an insuperable obstacle, was not yet completed, there seemed to be no other alternative than that the Gentile Christians should, by accepting circumcision and the law, incorporate themselves with the chosen people, in order to participate in the salvation brought and still to be brought

¹ Paul recognised in the circumstances that led him to turn his activity more and more to the Gentile world the Divine judgment on the increasing hardness of Judaism, and the Divine intention to bestow salvation on the heathen in their stead; and if he felt himself more and more called to be an apostle to the Gentiles, yet he could not persuade the heathen who had become believers to accept circumcision and the law, *i.e.* to become Jews. If the labour among the heathen thus enjoined on him obliged him somewhat to relax the rigour of his Pharisaic fulfilment of the law, like Peter in the house of Cornelius, he looked upon it as a command on the part of the Lord to become an *ἀνόμος* to the *ἀνόμοις*, in order to win them to the faith (1 Cor. ix. 21), even if he had not fully developed his later doctrine of the essential freedom of all believers from the law.

to them by their Messiah, just as the proselytes who desired to share the advantages of the Israelitish theocracy had always done. This demand was in fact made by members of the primitive Church at Antioch, but was decidedly rejected by Paul and Barnabas, because it would have brought into question all the results of their missionary labour, so that a violent dispute arose on the subject (Acts xv. 1). In this dispute it was made evident for the first time that notwithstanding the identity of the faith which Paul preached with that which he had formerly opposed (Gal. i. 23), the form of his evangelical preaching among the heathen differed not immaterially from that of the primitive apostles.² If the heathen whom he had won to the faith and received into the Church were to be persuaded to adopt circumcision and the law before they could attain to full

² There can be no question that we have here to do with an antithesis between justification by faith and by works, between the doctrine of a sect within Judaism and a universal religion of the world. Even according to the primitive apostolic preaching all salvation was exclusively given in the name of the Messiah (Acts iv. 12), who died for the sins of the people and was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures (1 Cor. xv. 3 f.). Nor had they any doubt that this salvation, already present in the forgiveness of sins and the communication of the Spirit, was received through repentance and the recognition of Jesus' Messiahship (Acts ii. 38); but the main thing for them was still the completion of the Israelitish theocracy, which the returning Messiah was to bring about, and in which all true (*i.e.* believing) Israelites who, in the strength of this faith had served Jehovah truly in accordance with His law, should participate. According to the prophecy of Scripture it was self-evident that all nations should finally attach themselves to the completed theocracy and be partakers of salvation in it. On the other hand Paul certainly preached the sending of the Messiah, His death on the cross, and His resurrection as a new act of God's favour, by which He purposed to save the lost world of sinners and bring them to temporal as well as eternal salvation. Those only who believed and trusted in His grace could partake of this salvation, as soon as they resolved to walk in a way well-pleasing to God, through the Spirit imparted to them. In this gospel as he preached it among the Gentiles, the law of Israel and the hope of the completion of their national theocracy had certainly no place.

participation in the Christian salvation, his preaching had fallen short of its aim, it had been in vain, since it was very doubtful whether the Gentiles gained over to believe in the Messiah would submit to this condition. Paul could only look on those who made such a demand as false brethren, who having no claim to Christian brotherhood had forced themselves into the Church at Antioch in an unauthorized way (Gal. ii. 4: *παρείσακτοι ψευδάδελφοί — παρεισῆλθον*), and was persuaded that neither the primitive Church as such, nor its rulers shared this view. In order therefore to prevent the Gentile Christians from being disturbed on this point, he determined to go to Jerusalem and there to challenge a decision in the matter that should put an end to the strife (ii. 2). The Church at Antioch also recognised this necessity; hence followed the proceedings in Jerusalem, whither Paul and Barnabas repaired with other associates (Gal. ii. 1, Acts xv. 2 ff.).

After the example of Tertullian (*contra Marcion*, 1, 20) and Eusebius, earlier writers, as Calvin, Bertholdt, Niemeyer (*de Temp. quo Ep. ad Gal. conscr. sit*, Gött., 1827), Guericke in his *Beitrage*, Böttger, and last of all Stölting (*Beiträge z. Exeg. der Paul. Briefe*, Gött., 1869), Caspari (*Geogr. chronol. Einl. in das Leben Jesu*, Hamb., 1869) looked upon the journey mentioned in Gal. ii. 1 as the second recorded in the Acts (xi. 30, xii. 15, comp. § 13, 4), although according to the transactions in Gal. ii. the question of circumcision could not have come up at all, since Acts xv. and the chronological statement of Paul make this entirely impossible. The fourteen years can neither be reckoned from his conversion, nor properly from the first Jerusalem journey, but in accordance with the context only from the beginning of his independent preaching of the gospel (i. 23 f.), which likewise coincides with his first appearance in Damascus and Jerusalem, and therefore, according to the usual reckoning (§ 13, 3) with the year 38; so that these occurrences took place about 52. On the other hand, Wieseler (comp. his *Comm. zum Galaterbrief*, Gött., 1859), after the example of certain predecessors such as Till, Credner and Köhler (*Versuch über die Abfassungszeit der apostol. Schriften*, Leipz., 1830), has identified Gal. ii. 1 with the journey in Acts xviii. 22, in which Paul discussed with the primitive apostles the meaning of the apostolic decree of Acts xv.; which is completely at variance with Paul's utterances respecting

the negotiations at Jerusalem. Most expositors, however, rightly maintain that Acts xv. is intended to give an account of the negotiations mentioned in Gal. ii., and if it be true that irreconcilable differences exist between the two accounts, as the Tübingen school professes to have discovered, it would not follow that the Acts had given an unhistorical account of these in the interest of a tendency, but that the source evidently used by them (§ 50, 3) recorded other negotiations at Jerusalem in which it does not appear that Paul and Barnabas were concerned, and that it was only by an error that they identified them with those in Gal. ii. But the former alleged differences are sufficiently explained if we consider that Paul's sole object was to prove that the gospel he had already preached for fourteen years was fully recognised by the primitive Church and its authorities, while the account of the Acts is concerned only with the recognition of the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the law, and consequently of the Pauline Gentile mission as such.³

4. It is certain that when Paul laid his (free) gospel before the authorities in Jerusalem, they added nothing to it (Gal. ii. 2-6), *i.e.* they did not require that the gospel he preached to the Gentiles should, besides the sole condition of faith which he laid down, impose Judaism on

³ Hence Paul gives prominence to the fact that he resolved to submit his gospel preached among the Gentiles to examination at Jerusalem, not because there was any necessity to do so, but because of a Divine revelation; while the Acts lay stress on the circumstance that the Church at Antioch sent him and Barnabas to Jerusalem in order to settle the dispute about the circumcision of the Gentile Christians. But nothing is more natural than that Paul should have challenged or accepted the resolution of the Church, in consequence of that very revelation, which convinced him of the necessity of such a step under the circumstances. In any case he went up, according to his own representation, with Barnabas and at least one other companion; he, too, certainly distinguishes from the separate transactions with the authorities of the Church, which essentially concerned their common activity (ii. 2, 6-10), the proceeding with the whole Church in which, without doubt, according to ii. 3-5, the freedom of Gentile Christians from the law, which formed the chief peculiarity of his gospel, came up for discussion, as the dispute relative to the circumcision of Titus shows. But while it was the Apostle's exclusive aim to show by this example how fully his gospel, which set the Gentiles free from the law, was recognised in Jerusalem, the Acts chiefly treat of the transactions by which the deliverance of the Gentile Christians from the law was arrived at.

them as a condition of participation in salvation. To the position they thus took up in favour of the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the law, Paul must have been indebted for the fact that Titus too was not compelled to be circumcised (ii. 3). But since he brings this forward as utterly refuting the idea that either the primitive Church or its authorities were of opinion that he had not by his preaching effectually attained his object of mediating salvation to the Gentiles, it follows that even the primitive Church conceded the principle of the freedom of the Gentile Christians, though disposed in the particular case of Titus to insist on circumcision.¹ But the fact that they did not enforce it against the refusal of the Apostle, can only have been due to the influence of their rulers. Moreover the Pauline account does not preclude the possible existence, even in Jerusalem, of a Pharisaic-minded party who required that the Gentile Christians should adopt the law and circumcision; nor the supposition that it was only after lengthened negotiations

¹ Paul indicates as clearly as possible that where Titus was concerned, the strangeness lay in the circumstance that he, an uncircumcised Greek, should nevertheless be the companion of Paul who, as a circumcised Jew, must necessarily by daily intercourse with such a one be contaminated (Gal. ii. 3). This was a case in which Paul could unquestionably have yielded to the demand for his circumcision, in order to avoid giving offence to his brethren in Jerusalem, whose legality was so scrupulous. He also expressly states that he did not withstand this demand from principle but on the ground of expediency, for the sake of false brethren who had already come to Antioch in order, by spying out some doubtful consequences of the freedom of the Gentile Christians, to bring about their bondage to the law (ii. 14), and who manifestly only make use of the contamination of Paul by his uncircumcised companion in order by this case to create a prejudice in favour of the necessary circumcision of the Gentile Christians, to which they might afterwards make universal appeal. Paul expressly says that he did not give way to the demand made by them, lest he should prejudice the truth of his free gospel (ii. 5). But it is equally at variance with the sense and the wording of the Pauline account to assume that with regard to this special question, or even the question of circumcision generally, matters had come to an irreconcilable difference between Paul and the primitive Church; whereas Paul had only repelled the constraint put upon him.

on the subject, and after Peter and James had fully explained their opposite wish, that this requisition was definitely rejected by the collective Church (Acts xv. 5-21).¹ On the other hand the determination, in accordance with the wish of James, to impose on the Gentiles abstinence from flesh offered to idols, fornication, blood and things strangled, had nothing whatever to do with the principle of the question as to the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the law, since this injunction had direct reference to the synagogue (Acts xv. 20 f.); inasmuch as it would have been an insuperable obstacle to the conversion of the Jews of the Diaspora, if they saw the formation of Churches of believers, who defiled themselves with abominations that were peculiarly heathen, and with whom, from very horror of these abominations, they could have had no community of faith. Hence it follows that the reiterated assertion that such a decree was directly at variance with Paul's statement that the primitive apostles added nothing to his gospel (Gal.

¹ The judgment with respect to the historical character of the proceedings set forth in the Acts depends essentially on the question as to whether they are taken from an earlier source, which is undoubtedly shown to be highly probable on literary and critical grounds (comp. § 50, 3). The difference which is obviously prominent in the apprehension of the question between Peter and James in spite of the agreement in result, creates a favourable presumption in its favour. The former, it is clear, draws the conclusion from the communication of the Spirit to Cornelius that the Gentiles are by faith put on an equality with the Jews before God, so far as they might attain true purity, to which circumcision was with the Jews only the first step, and therefore that this had become as unnecessary for them as the imposition of the law, by the ever imperfect fulfilment of which even those of the Jews who trusted in the grace of their Messiah did not hope to be delivered (xv. 7-10). On the other hand James is satisfied with asserting that God had called to Himself, according to prophecy, a new people from among the Gentiles, that should likewise be called by His name and should serve Him, but who were not to be burdened with the ordinances given to God's ancient people (Acts xv. 14-19). Prejudice alone can deny that both alike are far removed from Paul's position that the Gentiles as such were to be received into the Church (No. 3), or even from his later principle of the freedom of believers from the law.

ii. 6), *i.e.* nothing that he himself had not declared necessary for salvation, is quite untenable.

The idea that a part of the law, instead of the whole, was imposed on the Gentile Christians, is *a priori* quite inconceivable, since the law is always apprehended as an inseparable whole (Matt. v. 18; Jas. ii. 10; Gal. iii. 10), so that the fulfilment of isolated injunctions cannot absolve from obedience to all the rest, particularly as no special importance is anywhere in the law attached to these three points. Equally untenable is the assumption that by this means it was intended to place the Gentile Christians in relation to Jewish Christians in the position of proselytes of the gate (comp. Ritschl, Mangold, and others), viz. by imposing on them the Noachic commands or those given in Lev. xvii. 18, since even if the *πορνεία* be referred to incest or the forbidden degrees of marriage, which is quite an arbitrary explanation, some of these are always more strictly forbidden than others. The obvious explanation of the actual resemblance between these and the former commands is that these too were designed to remove the most prominent differences, such as arise in every community. Finally it is by no means at variance with the reasons assigned by James, if we regard this as the beginning of the formation of a Gentile-Christian code of morals. Just as the eating of flesh offered to idols was regarded by the Jews as defilement by a heathen abomination, a view shared by the primitive apostles (comp. Apoc. ii. 14, 20), so the eating of blood and of things strangled (in which blood still remains) was a heathen offence against the Holy One, since Jehovah appointed the blood of animals to be a sacrifice and thus consecrated it. But fornication, *i.e.* sexual intercourse without marriage, was an abomination specifically heathen, inasmuch as it was not among the Gentiles looked at from a moral standpoint as with the Jews, but was regarded as a complete matter of indifference. The assumption that the Acts only intended by this representation to give apostolic sanction to a Christian custom that originated much later, appeals in vain to the silence of the Apostle with respect to the so-called apostolic decree in the Epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians; for the opponents whom he here withstands did not even on their side recognise its leading design, since they required the Gentile Christians to be circumcised and to receive the law, so that the controversy had quite left its former ground. Equally incorrect is the view that Paul published the decree in his Churches, or even laboured in the spirit of it. He, too, naturally had forbidden fornication, not because it was at variance with the Mosaic law or with Jewish customs, but on the ground of its being inconsistent with the true Christian life which is the work of the Spirit. With respect to the flesh offered to idols, he only asked consideration for the weak Christian brethren, and only forbade absolutely all participation in sacrificial meals. He makes no mention whatever of the eating of blood.

From this it only follows that he did not regard this requirement from the Gentile Christians as the condition of their being set free from the law; he could not have done so, since he looked upon the latter as established *à priori*; nor did he by any means go to Jerusalem in order first to convince himself of its truth or to have it settled by a decree of the primitive apostles, but in order to protect his Gentile Christians against disturbance on the part of those Jews who were zealous for the law, by means of a decision of the primitive apostles and the primitive Church addressed to those Church circles over whom they had authority. The historical motive of the Jerusalem decree is expressly recognised in Acts xv. 24, and this itself precludes all obligation on the part of Paul with respect to Churches that he might found independently; but since he no longer expected the immediate conversion of all Israel, he did not regard the consideration for the synagogue demanded by the primitive apostles as necessary in his case (§ 13, 6).³

5. Paul's stipulations with the authorities in Jerusalem respecting their future work were just as important for him as the recognition of his free gospel (Gal. ii. 7-10). They had for their basis a recognition on the part of the primitive apostles that he was entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, to which they could add nothing (ii. 6), just as Peter (as admittedly the most prominent among the primitive apostles) was entrusted with that of the circumcision. Moreover, as appears from the result, Paul was authorised to preach as an apostle, viz. with a view, as he supposed, to the

³ How far the Acts are sufficiently clear with respect to these historical relations may be doubtful, since the form at least of the so-called apostolic decree naturally belongs to them alone (comp. § 50, 3); but it is by no means improbable that the primitive Church desired and ventured to expect their decree to be followed in the Churches of Syria and Cilicia, which had been mainly derived from that Church (xv. 23). It is even possible that the original apostles expected Paul also to work in accordance with their resolutions, but the Acts do not assert that they could have imposed it upon him as obligatory; rather does the only express mention of such conformity (xvi. 4; comp. § 15, 1, note 3), and the passage xxi. 25, where these demands upon the Gentile Christians (no longer indeed in the original sense of xv. 20 f.) appear as a concession on their part to Jewish zeal for the law, prove the contrary. The less able are we to conclude with Weizsäcker and Grimm from this passage, that a decree of the primitive Church which was not composed till afterwards, is transferred by the author of the Acts to the apostolic convention.

founding of Churches (ii. 7 f.).¹ But when on this basis the authorities of the primitive Church gave their hands to him and Barnabas, according to Paul's express statement as a symbol of fellowship in preaching the gospel, a work which they were to carry on among the Gentiles as the primitive apostles among the circumcision (ii. 9), both wording and context absolutely exclude the idea that the question here relates to a separation of fields of labour in order to prevent dispute respecting insoluble points of difference, or even to the concession of an activity in quite distinct circles, probably accompanied by certain reservations, which moreover could not have been hindered; the question relates rather to the dividing of common work in accordance with clear intimations of God. But if already existing facts had made it clear to the primitive apostles that God had now called the heathen to be partakers of the Messianic salvation, these very facts must have led them to perceive that in the apostle Paul, God had chosen a peculiar instrument for the Gentile mission, so that they might carry on the mission in Israel themselves; for until the hope of the conversion of all Israel was abandoned, this was their first and most urgent duty. From the importance of this compact, it is self-evident that the division of labour was not understood in a geographical but in an ethnographical sense, and that it only applied to the assumption of an obligation, but not to the marking out of exclusive rights.² Hence it

¹ The fact that it is not said *ἐνέργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῶν ἔθνῶν*, but *εἰς τὰ ἔθνη*, naturally does not prove that full apostolic calling was not granted to Paul, since the latter phrase undoubtedly, if we take the context into contact, is more fully explained in the sense of the former, especially as what the primitive apostles perceived was grounded in the facts of his consciousness. Moreover the fact that he is named only with Barnabas in ii. 9 proves nothing at all; since the question there turns only on that activity among the Gentiles which the latter shared, and from which the specific apostolic preaching that put Paul on a par with Peter, was by this very circumstance separated.

² Hereby the assumption of Mangold that the primitive apostles may

is perfectly clear that the sole exception introduced is the duty to remember the poor in the *περιτομή* (ii. 10). While released from the duty of co-operating in the conversion of Israel as such, he was not to consider himself absolved from care for the bodily necessities of his brethren according to the flesh, to which however he had fully attended.

6. The Jerusalem decrees presuppose as a matter of course that the Jewish Christians were to remain bound to the law afterwards as before, and Paul, according to Gal. v. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 17 f., did not at all think of opposing this idea; since the freedom which he claimed for himself rested solely upon the necessities of his official ministry (1 Cor. ix. 21). But there arose in mixed Churches the great difficulty, that

have understood the arrangement in an ethnographical sense, Paul in a geographical, falls away. A division in the geographical sense could only have had one meaning, if the question had to do with a peaceful separation; and it would have shut out the whole Jewish Diaspora from the primitive apostles, which, however, they looked upon in fact as their field of operation (1 Cor. ix. 5; 1 Pet. i. 1, v. 13; Jas. i. 1), and which, since they strove after the conversion of Israel as a nation, they could by no means exclude from their activity. Still less could Paul, when he perceived the Gentile mission to be his peculiar calling, renounce occasional activity among his countrymen, which moreover was called forth by ardent love for his own people (§ 13, 3); since it gave him among the Diaspora without, a natural link of connection with his Gentile apostolic ministry (§ 13, 6, note 1). If also his vocation to a mission among the Gentiles rested upon the circumstance that according to the counsel of God, the people of Israel were now hardened by their perversity, and the gospel taken from them was to be brought to the Gentiles, this did not preclude the necessity of testifying to the first-called nation how salvation was prepared for them, and how they were inexcusable if they rejected it; but in any case the object was to save what could still be saved. With this view Paul spoke of his endeavour to gain some among the Jews by the greatest possible condescension towards them (1 Cor. ix. 20 f.), even before mentioning his similar conduct towards the Gentiles; and in Rom. xi. 13 he gave prominence to the idea that his most zealous efforts in the Gentile mission had always in view the gaining of some of his own countrymen. His fundamental principle not to build on a foundation already laid (Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 15 f.) does not rest on the Jerusalem proposal, but upon his view of the specific task of an apostle (§ 13, 5).

the orthodox Jew dared not maintain intercourse, especially at table, with the uncircumcised believer, as was required by Church life at the lovefeasts.¹ There could indeed be no doubt that in Paul's case duty to Christian brotherly fellowship, no less than to his official calling, stood higher than duty to rules of life that had formerly been sacred; even if his theory of the essential freedom of the Christian from the law had still been far from complete. Nor had Peter any scruple in allowing the Gentile Christian brethren fellowship at table, since he looked upon uncircumcised believers as purified from all heathen profanity and made equal by God Himself to the members of the chosen race (Acts xv. 9); and he carried his principles into practice on the occasion of a visit to Antioch, which he seems to have made soon after the transactions at Jerusalem.² But a step was thus taken towards emancipation from orthodox social life, which might easily lead farther. Peter's conduct, however, gave offence at Jerusalem, because it seemed to invalidate the premisses on which the decrees there made were based. It now appeared how difficult it would be to put into practice the principle on which James had conceded the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the law (No. 4, note 2). If the free Gentiles, as a newly-called people of God, stood side by side with the former people of God, there was no reason for the latter to give up any legal duty for the sake of fellowship with the *former*. This standpoint was taken up by *τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, who had come to Antioch,

¹ This case had not come under consideration at Jerusalem, because there was no regular council held there to decide all doubtful questions, but an answer was simply sought to a concrete question. The abstinence required from the Gentile Christians was by no means imposed on them for the sake of fellowship with the Jewish Christian brethren, but out of consideration for the synagogue, *i.e.* unbelieving Judaism; such abstinence was far from sufficient to enable them to have intercourse at table.

² Moreover, this corresponded entirely with the fulfilment of the law as taught by Christ, for He too placed love higher than all ceremonial obligations.

and who, whether expressly sent by James or not, certainly represented his view in this matter; and Peter was weak enough to withdraw from the Gentile Christians, contrary to his own better conviction, rather than incur the odium of a want of fidelity to the law. He must have done this so demonstratively as to lead Barnabas and the whole Jewish Christian part of the Church into similar hypocrisy, *i.e.* to deny their former approved better conviction. The offence justly excited in the Gentile Christian majority of the Church was so great that Paul felt compelled to accuse him before the whole Church of direct apostasy from evangelical truth, and to censure his conduct openly (Gal. ii. 11-14).

The statement of Paul presupposes most definitely that Peter, in holding communion at table with the Gentiles, followed his true conviction, which he denied before the adherents of James, from fear of man. Nothing but sheer caprice can assert that it was the very reverse, and that Peter only went back to his own and the primitive apostles' view after having followed an inconsistent practice for so long under the imposing influence of Paul in the Church at Antioch. Naturally, the details in Gal. ii. 14-21 cannot be intended as a verbal repetition of what Paul said to Peter at that time; rather do they throw light on the question from a doctrinal point of view, the aspect under which he treats of the bondage of the Gentile Christians to the law throughout the Galatian Epistle. But nevertheless the concrete reproaches he made against Peter at that time stand out with sufficient clearness. Unquestionably the decisive point here was that by this means he indirectly compelled the Gentiles to accept the law, thus depriving them of the freedom that had been conceded to them at Jerusalem (ii. 14); for if the Jewish Christians refused Christian brotherhood to the Gentiles on account of their heathen mode of life, there was no alternative for those who could not or would not do without such fellowship but on their side to remove the hindrance by adopting the Jewish mode of life. Thus he denied the conviction he had himself expressed in Jerusalem, *viz.* that the Jewish Christians could not fulfil the law, and therefore hoped to be saved by the grace of the Messiah alone (Acts xv. 10 f.; comp. Gal. ii. 15 f.). It is making Christ the minister of sin, to be led by this faith in Him to regard the observance of the law as no longer necessary to salvation, and yet, by returning to a strict observance of it, to condemn the former free position with respect to the law, adopted on the ground of such faith, as a sinful transgression of it (Gal. ii.

17 f.). As to the rest, the way in which Paul argues exclusively from his own personal experience, shows that he only gives expression here to the fundamental view at which in the struggle with Judaism he had himself arrived as the definite solution of the ever-recurring question of the law.

It was this occurrence in Antioch, which, as the pseudo-Clementines show, heretical Jewish Christianity never forgave the apostle Paul, and which made it his most implacable enemy; on the other hand, it gave occasion to heretical Gnosis to reject the authority of the primitive apostles and to accuse them of falsifying the gospel (§ 8, 5). On it the Tübingen school based their view of the fundamental opposition between Paul and the primitive apostles, which led to a struggle between the two parties that filled the entire apostolic period and was never settled (§ 3, 1). Nevertheless, it only completes the proof of the exact opposite, which is clearly involved in the Pauline account of the transactions in Jerusalem.³ Nor can it by any means be shown, as Holsten recently assumes, that a reaction, which under the leadership of James changed the mild Petrine Jewish Christianity which originally characterized the primitive Church into a Judaistic contrast, dates from the dispute at Antioch, in which the consequences of Paulinism were first fully and consciously recognised.

7. Doubtless the primitive apostles on their part adhered

³ Not only the manifest assumption here made that Peter was at one with Paul in principle on the question respecting the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the law, as well as with regard to the priority of brotherly duty over obligation to the ceremonial law, but the whole narrative of the conflict has in the context of Gal. ii. only one meaning, if it is Paul's object to show that his free gospel was not only recognised by the primitive apostles (ii. 1-10), but was in case of necessity upheld by him in opposition to them (ii. 11-21). If indeed he meant that they separated entirely and for ever on the occasion of this proceeding on his part, this would have deprived the argument contained in ii. 1-10 of all meaning and value; his meaning therefore can only be that he convicted Peter of his mistake and at the same time obtained his renewed assent to the gospel of freedom from the law.

to the law, till the destruction of the Temple made its observance impossible, for they saw in this event a Divine intimation that the time of the Old Testament law was past. On the other hand, Paul by degrees attained to a conviction founded on theoretical and doctrinal principles, of the essential freedom of the believer from the law; and the Epistle to the Hebrews shows that the perception of the fact that the law found its end in Christ, could be theoretically developed even in primitive apostolic circles. But it cannot be proved that this differing conception of the question of law ever led to a conflict between Paul and the primitive apostles, nor that the latter in particular ever retracted their recognition of the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the law, which had been pronounced in the Jerusalem transactions. Just as Peter and James differed, so too was there a difference within the primitive Church, as to how far communion with Gentile Christians permitted some relaxation of legal strictness; but this question had little practical influence on the primitive Church, since those only who had freer views in the matter would have consented to labour in such fields of the Diaspora as would have brought them into contact with heathen already converted. On the other hand, it is easily conceivable that the Pharisaic party, who were subordinate at the transactions in Jerusalem, came forward again very soon with their pretensions, and endeavoured to effect a transition to Judaism in the case of the newly-gained Gentile Christians. But that any of the primitive apostles, or even James, favoured their agitations cannot be shown. If this party carried on the struggle against Paul in his defence of the freedom of his Gentile Christians, so far as to contest his apostolic authority, of which there is no documentary evidence at least to the extent generally assumed, yet we have not the slightest indication that the primitive apostles ever drew back from the compact made with Paul at Jerusalem, or that they ever took offence at the Gentile

mission of the Apostle and its great results, not to speak of disputing his apostolic authority. For their part they devoted themselves, afterwards as before, to the mission among Israel exclusively, whether in Palestine or the Diaspora, till the increasing obstinacy of the nation, which was confirmed by the judgment of God in the year 70, annihilated every hope of the conversion of all Israel, and until the death of the Gentile Apostle, whose vocation was from God, compelled them to enter into the predestined work of the Gentile mission. On the contrary, Paul himself, in the very heat of controversy with the Judaists, recognised the primitive apostles as such (Gal. i. 17-19); and it is entirely incorrect to suppose that there is some irony in his designation of them as οἱ δοκοῦντες (ii. 2, 6, 9). He classes himself with them quite freely (1 Cor. iv. 9, ix. 5, xii. 28 f.), emphasizing the identity of his gospel with theirs (xv. 3 f., 11), and calling himself the least among them (xv. 8); that the ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι (2 Cor. xi. 5, 13, xii. 11) were the primitive apostles, can only be maintained in opposition to the clear sense and connection of these passages.

With the whole section, and in particular the so-called apostolic Council, compare the latest treatises by Lipsius, art. *Apostelconvent* in Schenkel's *Bibellez.*, i., 1869; Pfeiderer, *Paulinismus*, Leipzig, 1873; Weizsäcker, *das Apostelconcil* (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1873, 1). Keim, *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, iv., Zürich, 1878; Holsten, *das Evang. des Paulus*, Berlin, 1880; Grimm, *der Apostelconvent* (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1880, 3); F. Zimmer, *Galaterbrief und Apostelgeschichte*, Hildburghausen, 1882; Pfeiderer, *der Apostelconvent* (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1883, 1); Holtzmann, *der Apostelconvent* (*ibid.*, 1882, 4; 1883, 2).

§ 15. PAUL AS A FOUNDER OF CHURCHES.

1. It seems to have been soon after the transactions in Jerusalem that Paul planned a visit to the Churches that had been founded on the first missionary journey (Acts xv. 36).¹ It was only natural that he should ask Barnabas,

¹ How far he entertained ulterior plans of an entirely independent

with whom he had made this journey, to accompany him. But because Barnabas wished to take his cousin Mark with him again, who had proved himself on the former journey to be untrustworthy, Paul fell out with him, and allowed the two to go to Cyprus alone, while he chose Silas (Silvanus), also a native of Jerusalem, as his companion, and after having visited the places of his former activity in Syria and Cilicia, repaired with him to the Churches in Lycaonia (Acts xv. 37-40).

It is quite an error on the part of the Tübingen school to suppose that in putting forward the purely personal dispute respecting Mark, the Acts conceal the much more serious motive that led to the separation from Barnabas, consisting in differences which arose at Antioch regarding fellowship at table with the Gentile Christians. For Barnabas, like Peter himself (§ 14, 6, note 2), must at that time have been convinced by Paul; and the mention of him in 1 Cor. ix. 6 implies anything but an estrangement in principle. According to Acts xv. 22-32, Silas was a prominent member of the primitive Church, and with Judas Barsabas accompanied Paul and Barnabas when they carried the so-called apostolic decree to Antioch. But since the writing was addressed not merely to Antioch but also to Syria and Cilicia generally, it can only be due to an incorrect inference that Luke, in ver. 33, makes the two delegates return to Jerusalem, which does not at all agree with ver. 40; for which reason the copyists thought it necessary to interpolate ver. 34. It is much more probable that Paul himself travelled with them through Syria and Cilicia for the purpose of delivering the apostolic missive, and only asked Silas to accompany him after he had passed over the Taurus into Lycaonia, while Judas returned home. Moreover, since it is impossible to understand why these two reliable men were dispatched with the apostolic letters, as if Paul and Barnabas were mistrusted in Antioch, the conjecture forces itself on the mind that the sending of these two, so expressly made prominent and yet on this occasion so meaningless, is an erroneous reminiscence of the sending of the *τρεῖς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, Gal. ii. 12, which did not take place until later, and in connection with

activity, as might easily be conceived after the recognition just obtained for his free gospel and the express assignment to him of the Gentile mission, must remain uncertain. Paul seems to have waited in expectation of a more definite Divine intimation, and in the meantime, by visiting the Churches he had formerly founded, to put himself in the way of receiving such intimation.

the apostolic decree. It then first becomes clear that Paul had come to a perfect understanding, not only with Peter and Barnabas, but also with the messengers of the primitive Church, and as a sign of his agreement with them, accompanied them through Syria and Cilicia, where it was their wish and intention to arrange matters according to the apostolic decree.²

His abode in the Lycaonian cities was of decisive importance to Paul, from the fact, that he found in Lystra a young man who must have been already converted at the Apostle's first coming, since in 1 Cor. iv. 17 Paul calls him his spiritual child, and he was now of repute in all places even as far as Iconium on account of his Christian life. This Timothy was the son of a mixed marriage, and had been piously brought up and instructed in the Scriptures from his childhood, by his Jewish mother Eunice and his grandmother Lois (2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15), and was perhaps brought to the preacher of the gospel by those who were already converted before him (iii. 14). By the voices of the prophets in the Church he was now pointed out to Paul as one peculiarly adapted to be an apostolic assistant (1 Tim. i. 18). One circumstance only appeared to stand in the way. As naturally his heathen father had not caused him to be circumcised, it was to be feared that wherever Paul came, the Jews would take offence at his living in such close fellowship with one who was un-circumcised, just as offence had been taken in Jerusalem at his intercourse with Titus (Gal. ii. 3). Thus at the very commencement the Jews would hold back from his own ministry and that of his assistant. Therefore he had him circumcised (Acts xvi. 1 ff.).³ How important to the

² This Silas is moreover called by Paul, and in 1 Pet. v. 12, by his full Latin name Silvanus, of which Silas is only the abbreviated Greek form. Many, quite without reason, have tried to identify him with Titus (comp. Märker in the *Meininger Gymnasialprogramm*, 1864; Graf, in Heidenheim's *Deutscher Vierteljahrsschrift*, 1865; and again recently Zimmer, in Luthardt's *Zeitschr. f. kirchl. Wissenschaft*, 1881, 4; Seuffert, in the *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 1885, 3. Against Zimmer, comp. Jülicher, *Jahrb. für protest. Theol.*, 1882, 3).

The Tübingen school indeed asserts that this must be unhistorical,

Apostle was the finding of this assistant, may be seen from the solemn act in which Timothy was formally dedicated to the office of evangelist by the laying on of the hands of the Apostle and the presbytery of his Church (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6). In the fact that he was brought to him, Paul manifestly saw an intimation that the time to unfold a new independent missionary activity had now come, since Timothy was not to accompany him on a single journey, like Silas, of whose connection with the Apostle there is no further mention, but was to be his constant assistant in mission work. This explains the reason why he gave up the visitation of the Pisidian and Pamphylian Churches, and repaired forthwith to a new mission field.⁴

since it is directly at variance with his conduct in the case of Titus; it overlooks the fact, however, that Paul there expressly declares that he refused to circumcise Titus only on account of the false brethren (§ 14, 4, note 1), while in this case he did it solely on behalf of his ministry among the Jews, which is quite in accord with the principles he enunciates in 1 Cor. ix. 20. Moreover it must not be overlooked that he made his impending journey with the Jerusalemite Silas, who perhaps himself had some scruple as to such constant and close intercourse with one who was uncircumcised. Paul, who invariably demanded consideration for the weak, could accommodate himself to such scruples as unhesitatingly as he refused the requirement of the false brethren, who wished by this means to create a precedent for their unauthorized claims on the heathen. Keim, Mangold, and even Pfeleiderer have declared this trait to be historical.

⁴ Criticism has taken peculiar offence at the circumstance that Paul, who nowhere else mentions the apostolic decree (comp. § 14, 4) is said to have formally published it in the Lycaonian Churches (Acts xvi. 4). But it is overlooked that these Churches were not his independent mission field, but were founded in a journey undertaken with Barnabas by order of the Church at Antioch; and that when Antioch had accepted the resolutions of the apostles at Jerusalem, it was only natural to introduce them into the daughter Churches of Antioch. At all events, nothing is opposed to the view that no certain historical knowledge, but a presumption on the part of the Acts, is here brought forward. The conjecture is even probable in connection with the preceding discussions that this notice in the source of Luke, which is partly lost here, referred to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia (xv. 40), and was falsely transferred to the Churches of Lycaonia.

2. From the account of the Acts as to the ways by which the Apostle was led to Troas, where the true object of his independent activity was to be pointed out to him (Acts xvi. 6 f.), it appears in the first place that he wished to begin his work again as an apostle in Asia Minor, but was prevented by the Spirit. This is expressly stated with respect to Asia and Bithynia, districts in which, according to 1 Pet. i. 1, there must have been Jewish-Christian Churches at that time; hence the intimation of the Spirit was intended to show that he was not to begin his work here, but to seek out a place where he might lay the first foundation; for he afterwards expressly puts this forward as his apostolic principle (comp. § 14, 5, note 2). For that very reason he was compelled without further delay to travel through Phrygia that belonged to Asia, and to pass by Mysia also a part of the same country, but was on no account to set foot in Bithynia.¹ It is remarkable, however, that the term *διήλθον*, used of the mere passing through, is also applied to the *Γαλατικὴ χώρα*, where according to 1 Pet. i. 1 there must have been Jewish Churches already, and yet the founding refers only to the province of Asia to which *Galatia* did not belong. This can only be explained on the assumption that Galatia was taken on the journey, though without any intention of beginning a ministry in that place; and yet there could have been no word of any hindrance, since Paul did actually work there. Moreover we learn from Gal. iv. 13 that it was sickness which obliged the Apostle to make a longer stay, of

¹ Asia is here the Roman province to which Mysia, Lydia, Caria and Phrygia belonged. That Phrygia is here distinguished from it, as is generally assumed, is decidedly incorrect, since the very fact that they went through Phrygia without beginning any operations there, is owing to the circumstance that they were hindered from preaching in Asia. In like manner their passing by Mysia is also mentioned; and this too arose from the same hindrance. The alleged narrower use of the term Asia may be chiefly founded on ii. 9, and this perhaps comes from the source of Luke, where a single part of the province of Asia, to which many of those present belonged, may be specially named.

which he availed himself to preach the gospel. Galatia was indeed large enough to afford abundant opportunity for preaching in places where the Diaspora mission of the primitive Church had not yet laid a foundation (comp. § 14, 2); and the surprisingly favourable reception he met with, which years after he still recalled with deep emotion (Gal. iv. 14 f.), must have influenced him not to stop short at the town in which he had first been detained, but to carry the blessing of the gospel to others also. But the Acts in xviii. 23 unquestionably imply that the Galatian Churches were already founded on this journey, though in pursuance of their whole plan they find no motive for recording the fruit of his activity in that place, since they do not recognise it as the divinely appointed object of this journey, and in fact it was only incidental.

The Galatians, although understanding Greek and in many ways influenced by Greek culture, were by no means Asiatics. Whether Jerome's statement that they still spoke their native tongue which was allied to that of the Treviri, ought not to be modified, has been recently questioned. They were descended from Celtic tribes who coming from Gaul in their predatory expeditions had visited the Thracian-Greek peninsula. Some had thrown themselves into Asia Minor, and, after varying fortunes, had there founded a kingdom, whose last king favoured by the Romans, extended his dominion far beyond Galatia proper (Gallo-Græcia). Even when his land had become a Roman province (26 A.D.), they still retained their division into the three tribes of the Tectosagi, Tolistoboi, and Trocmi, their old Celtic constitution, their popular representation, and a far-reaching self-government. The old Celtic Nature religion amalgamated more or less with Greek myth and Roman Cæsar-worship. The assumption formerly prevailing that the Galatians (or, according to Meyer, at least the tribe of the Tectosagi), were of German origin, is still obstinately defended by Wieseler (*Die deutsche Nationalität der Kleinas. Gal.*, Gütersloh, 1877; *Zur Geschichte der kl. G.*, Greifswald, 1879), but has long since been refuted (Sieffert, *Gal. und seine ersten Christengemeinden*, Gotha, 1871; W. Grimm and Herzberg in *den Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, of 1876 and 1878). Those who suppose that the Churches of Lycaonia (the new Galatians) were the Galatian Churches to which Paul afterwards wrote (§ 13, 4, note 3) make the Apostle here, as a matter of course, travel through Galatia proper without stopping.

Here, on the soil of a peculiar nation, Paul unquestionably exercised from the commencement a Gentile apostolic ministry without the medium of any synagogue; for, after what has been said above, he certainly would not have preached in one of the larger cities, as Pessinus and Ancyra, where there were greater Jewish communities, and therefore also conventicles, whose members believed in the Messiah. The epistle, in which a trace of Jewish elements is found only in iii. 26-28, and where the Church as such is constantly addressed as specifically Gentile Christian (iv. 8 ff., v. 2, vi. 12) shows that some of his countrymen had been converted quite incidentally, whose views were free enough to admit them fully into the Church of the uncircumcised.²

3. *Troas*, situated a little south of the mouth of the Hellespont, on the coast of the district of Asia Minor bearing the same name, was built by Antigonus, and after Augustus was a Roman colony of considerable extent. Here Paul received the Divine intimation which led him over into Macedonia; here too a Greek physician called Luke became his associate (Col. iv. 14); and it is quite possible that the sufferings consequent on the sickness Paul had in Galatia may have led to his acquaintance with him. They took ship immediately to Neapolis, a small harbour on the Strymonian Gulf, which at that time belonged to Thrace; and the Acts appear to give express prominence to the fact that it was in the very first city of the district of Macedonia they entered, that they made a halt (Acts xvi. 9-12). This was the old border-fortress *Philippi*, on the stream Gangas, under whose walls

² The singular view of Mynster, Credner, and others, that the Church consisted merely of proselytes, rests on a false explanation of iv. 9, and appeals in vain to the Apostle's Old Testament proofs, since the Old Testament was read from the beginning without question in the assemblies of the Christians for worship (iv. 21), and Jewish Christian agitators, who took their stand upon the Old Testament, and were already at work in the Church. Baur, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, and Hofmann have adopted the view that the Churches were exclusively Gentile Christian.

the famous battle between the Roman republicans and the heirs of Cæsar was fought. Through Octaviannus it received the *jus Italicum*, and became a *κολωνία*, from which, as a centre, mining operations in the gold and silver pits of the neighbouring Pangæus were successfully carried on. There was no Jewish population here worth mentioning; they had not even a synagogue, but only a place of prayer outside the city, by the river, where there was facility for the sacred ablutions, and whither women almost exclusively seem to have resorted, partly Jewesses married to Gentiles, partly Gentile women who had embraced the faith of Israel. But Paul did not neglect to seek out this place on the Sabbath; and the fruit of his going was the conversion of a dealer in purple from Thyatira, called Lydia, who opened her house to the missionaries, and thus established a firm centre for the mission in the city (xvi. 13 ff.). The very meagre account in the Acts, which hasten forward to the catastrophe, does not allow us to guess how long Paul worked here; and yet, to judge by the result, it cannot have been a very short time, for he succeeded in gaining a Church mainly Gentile-Christian, which must have been of some importance. This Church remained bound to him by ties of love and obedience, so that he calls it his joy and crown (Phil. i. 8, ii. 12, iv. 1). It must also have been a wealthy Church; and we see the confidential relation towards it in which the Apostle stood, from the circumstance that he not only allowed it to maintain him, but afterwards even accepted frequent help from it; for from the first this Church manifested great zeal for the mission (i. 4, iv. 10, 15 f.; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 8 f.). The incidental mention of two women, as well as of Epaphroditus, Clement, and others, who were there his associates amid toil and struggle (ii. 25, iv. 2 f.), also points to a longer period of activity on his part in the place. It was only by an incident that brought him into conflict with the rulers that an unforeseen end was put to

his work. Comp. Schinz, *Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi*, Zurich, 1833.

The Acts speak only of a few days that preceded Paul's first Sabbath visit to the place of prayer, and of many days in which the damsel with a spirit of divination, who, as appears, first met him on a later visit, repeatedly molested the Apostle (xvi. 12, 18). At the first meeting with her, Luke must have been present (xvi. 16), but no trace of his presence is observable any more; a circumstance which obviously explains the complete obscurity respecting the extent of his operations there, as well as the scanty account of their true purport. The expulsion of the spirit of divination is immediately followed by proceedings against Paul and Silas on the part of those in whose service the divining damsel was, who accused them before the Roman decemvirs administering justice in the colonial city, with introducing foreign religious customs. According to the narrative of the Acts, these latter, urged on by the people, had them beaten with rods and thrown into prison, where they were thrust into the stocks; but the decemvirs were obliged on the following day, when Paul made good his Roman citizenship, themselves to fetch them out of the prison, and they desired them to depart out of the city (xvi. 19-40).³

4. *Thessalonica*, the chief town of the second Macedonian district, as the seat of the Roman prefect and a favourite place of commerce owing to its position on the Thermaic Gulf and the great Roman military road (via Egnatiana), was the most important city of the whole province. Here too there was a large Jewish population, who had their own synagogue, and to whom therefore Paul first turned when he came hither from Philippi. The Acts speak only of two to three weeks' work among them, during which he

³ The catastrophe, which is also hinted at in 1 Thess. ii. 2, is thus copiously narrated on account of the wonderful conversion of the jailer (xvi. 25-34), which however has no influence upon the course of events; and the entire representation, involved in so much obscurity, shows that Luke was certainly no longer present in Philippi during this catastrophe. On the other hand, there is no reason for the assumption that Timothy was absent because he was not affected by it; since we do not find him co-operating in the expulsion of demons, or otherwise acting independently. On the contrary, it is incorrectly supposed that he remained behind in Philippi, because he is not mentioned at the departure from it; whereas he is mentioned again in xvii. 14, where he was obliged to separate for the first time from Paul, whom he had accompanied uninterruptedly since leaving Lystra.

preached every sabbath in the synagogue; and in addition to some Jews, converted a multitude of Greek proselytes and women of distinction (xvii. 1-4). Nevertheless Paul must have worked here for a much longer time; and after sufficiently proving the unsusceptibility of his countrymen, probably turned entirely to his Gentile mission. He had undertaken work, and by means of night-labour supported himself, though scantily, by his handicraft (1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8), so that he had repeatedly to receive supplies from Philippi (Phil. iv. 16); a circumstance which led to a continued abode in his present quarters. Whilst his preaching in the synagogue, as related in the Acts, set forth the usual Scripture proof of the Messiahship of Him who died and rose again, his first epistle gives us a clear picture of his specifically apostolic preaching as addressed to the Gentiles there (comp. especially 1 Thess. i. 9 f.).¹ As they joyfully received his word as a Divine message (i. 6, ii. 13), he succeeded in gathering an important Church, not mixed (comp. Holsten, *Jahrb. für Protest. Theolog.*, 1876, 1), but Gentile Christian (i. 9, ii. 14), consisting mainly of small traders and mechanics (iv. 6, 11), and which had already its special overseers for the administration of external affairs, as well as for the discipline and direction of Church-life (v. 12). But

¹ The often repeated conjecture that his preaching has here a prevailing apocalyptic character, is quite chimerical. It was natural that the Messianic preaching among the Gentiles should occupy itself not with the promised future of salvation, but with the judgment that was expected to accompany it. In order to escape this the heathen were admonished to turn from idols to the worship of the living and true God (i. 9), to serve Him according to the precepts of the Apostle with blameless holiness, to which end God hath given them the Holy Spirit at their calling (iv. 7 f.), and await the second coming of Jesus who had been raised from the dead, who as His Son would deliver believers from the wrath to come (i. 10). Though we certainly have here all the main characteristics of the Pauline preaching, since even the effect of his teaching is traced back to the Divine election and the co-operation of the Holy Spirit (i. 4 f.), yet it is a very significant fact that all the richer theological elements of his developed system are entirely wanting.

even after the founding of the Church he still worked among them for a long time (ii. 11 f.) and that amid much opposition to which he was exposed from the beginning (ii. 2), just as they too had to suffer constant persecution from their countrymen (ii. 6, 14, iii. 4). Of all this the Acts tell nothing; their only object is to show how the fanaticism of the Jews; who persisted in their unbelief in spite of all the labour bestowed on them by the Apostle, led to the premature ending of the missionary work. Since, happily, they were not able to find the missionaries themselves, they dragged their host, a certain Jason, and some members of the Christian Church before the rulers of the city, and accused them of harbouring strangers who turned the whole world upside down with their treasonable preaching of the kingdom of Jesus. The officials, however, wisely contented themselves with taking bail from the accused that no revolutionary project was on foot, and allowed them to go unharmed. But Paul and his companions deemed it advisable to depart by night (Acts xvii. 5-10). Comp. Burgerhoudt, *de cœtus Christ. Thess. ortu fatisque*, Lugd. Bat., 1825.

5. The last Macedonian city in which Paul worked was *Berœa*, one of the oldest cities of the country, situated on the river Astræus, in a fruitful region of the third district. It was not without anxiety for the young and still unconsolidated Church, that Paul left Thessalonica, and after coming hither, he frequently thought of returning to it; but the attitude of his enemies there, which was still menacing, made it impossible (1 Thess. ii. 17 f.). He was destined to learn the persistent character of fanaticism soon enough. In *Berœa* his success was unexpectedly great, in the synagogue, as well as among Greek men and women even of the higher ranks. But scarcely had news of this reached Thessalonica when Jews of that place made their appearance here too, with the object of stirring up the populace; and Paul, against whom their hatred was chiefly directed, was compelled to make for

the sea-coast (on the Thermaic Gulf) with all possible speed, in order by taking ship to escape their snares. From thence he was conducted by some of the new converts, whose zeal for his safety is vividly portrayed in the Acts, to Athens, availing themselves of the first opportunity by ship, because they would not leave him till they had made sure that he was safe (Acts xvii. 10-15). In Athens Paul first set foot on the soil of Greece proper. It appears that he had not in view a proper mission work here, but only desired to wait for his companions who had been left behind in Berœa, since it was only by the opportunity that presented itself that he had been brought to this place.¹ But he could not look on at the abominable idolatry that met his sight in numberless temples and altars; and without neglecting to speak to Jews and proselytes in the synagogue according to his custom, he daily availed himself of the opportunity to offer the gospel

¹ The reason why Silas and Timothy remained behind in Berœa is not quite clear (xvii. 14). It almost appears as if their stay was merely intended to mask the flight of Paul and ensure its success. The Acts at least know nothing of any intimation that they were to carry on the work so hopefully begun by Paul; for Paul sends them a summons by his returning companions, to come to him as speedily as possible, viz. to Athens, where he awaits them (xvii. 15 f.). It is customary to infer from 1 Thess. iii. 1 f., that Timothy at least did actually follow him thither, but was immediately sent back by him to Thessalonica, in order to strengthen the Church, respecting which he still suffered great anxiety, and to bring him news of it (iii. 5). But the words do not necessarily imply this, since Paul, who could no longer bear this anxiety, preferred to be left alone in Athens, even though, renouncing the hope of his companion's arrival, he sent him counter orders to Berœa, as has been recently acknowledged by v. Soden (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1895, 2). Moreover, since 1 Thess. iii. 1 contains no intimation of the presence of Silas, he must have commanded him also to remain in Berœa, in contravention of his first summons (xvii. 15); for as a matter of fact he was first joined by both again in Corinth (xviii. 5) and no reason is assigned why Silas did not follow that first command. But the Acts are always imperfectly acquainted with such matters, since they make the Apostle expect both in Athens, and therefore are equally ignorant of a countermand of the order given in xvii. 15, and of Timothy's being sent to Thessalonica.

to the Gentiles in conversation at the market-place. Very soon, even adherents of the two most popular and numerous philosophical schools attached themselves to the new philosopher, whose preaching, which insisted upon a new manner of life, touched their interests most closely; and the novelty-seeking, controversy-loving multitude were desirous to hear him deliver a public discourse on the Areopagus. For some time he gained their ear, since he adapted himself adroitly to their views; but when he began to speak of the resurrection of Christ they derided him; and his success in Athens appears to have been very small (Acts xvii. 16-34).²

6. The ancient splendour of Corinth had fallen into wreck and ruin when the last Grecian power had been overthrown by the Romans under Mummius (146 B.C.); but it was now almost a century since Julius Cæsar had begun the re-colonization of the place; and new Corinth, which had been

² That the Athenian discourse neither is nor is meant to be a verbal report follows from the fact that Paul was alone in Athens, according to Acts xvii. 16 as well as 1 Thess. iii. 1, and none of his companions who could have written it from recollection, was with him. If, notwithstanding the admitted relative want of success of the discourse, the Acts still make it representative of his Gentile preaching, just as they make his discourse at Antioch representative of his preaching there (Acts xiii.), it follows that what the author had heard of it and endeavours to reproduce in a free way, must have been regarded by him as characteristic of the way in which he had often heard it repeated. In fact here too, after preaching the one true God, and seeking to unite their historical and human, with their religious consciousness, he calls them to repentance in prospect of the impending judgment, as well as to faith in Jesus made possible to all by His resurrection (comp. No. 4, note 1). Among the few who became believers in Athens there were a member of the Areopagus, Dionysius by name, and a woman named Damaris. Whether the isolation in which he found himself, or anxiety respecting the Thessalonian Church paralysed his efficiency, or whether he regarded Athens from the first as a sphere not adapted for great activity and only desired to wait here for his friends before going farther, we do not know. In the latter case he would have departed as soon as it was decided that Timothy should go to Thessalonica and Silas remain in Berea (comp. note 1), and would now for the first time have set out for the place which he had evidently destined from the beginning to be the centre of his mission in Hellas proper.

the seat of the proconsul of the Roman province Achaia since B.C. 27, rapidly sprang up again. The situation of the town on the isthmus, with its harbours to east and west, made it the centre of the world's commerce, while the fame of the Isthmian games and the mildness of the climate attracted a stream of strangers to the place, thus leading to the accumulation of great wealth. The arts and sciences flourished there, the fame of the Corinthian pillars was worldwide, but so too was that of the luxury and corrupt morals of the city, whose unchastity had become a proverb (*κορινθιάζεσθαι, κορινθία κόρη*). In the temple of Aphrodite a thousand priestly maidens prostituted themselves in honour of the goddess; it was with reference to the life and practices he here saw that Paul wrote his description of heathenism culminating in unnatural lust and complete moral indifferentism (Rom. i. 21-32). When Paul came hither he at once made arrangements for a long stay; he sought and found work with a countryman of his own and a fellow-tradesman, a Pontine Jew called Aquila, who with Priscilla his wife had lately come hither from Italy, after the Jews had been expelled from Rome by an edict of the Emperor Claudius (Suet., *Claud.*, 25), and who with his whole household was unquestionably first converted by the Apostle. Here, too, he began his ministry in the synagogue, though by no means confining himself to this; his relation to Judaism appears, however, to have been strained from the commencement (1 Thess. iii. 7), his activity only becoming more intense when Silas and Timothy arrived and the latter relieved him in a great measure of the anxiety he felt for the Church at Thessalonica by the accounts he brought from it. This however seems to have at once raised the enmity of the Jews against him to its highest pitch, so that matters came to an entire breach with the synagogue. As Paul had formerly declared in Pisidian Antioch, so too here he is said to have expressly stated that he must hold them responsible for

their own perdition, since he was now compelled to turn exclusively to the Gentiles. He left the synagogue in a demonstrative way, and for his headquarters chose the neighbouring house of a proselyte, Titius Justus by name. But just as isolated instances of success had formerly not failed him, so too this catastrophe seems to have resulted in a split in the synagogue itself; Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue went over to Christianity with his whole house, and was baptized by Paul himself. The conversion of Stephanas, whom Paul calls the firstfruits of Achaia, must also belong to this time, since the earlier converted Jews were strangers there. This convert afterwards, with his house, took a zealous interest in the affairs of the Church (1 Cor. xvi. 15). From the same period also dates the conversion of Caius, with whom Paul afterwards was accustomed to lodge when he visited Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23); for Paul names both among those whom he personally baptized (1 Cor. i. 14, 16). The Acts trace back to an express Divine revelation the fact that Paul after the former catastrophe turned with new joy entirely to the Gentile mission, so that his stay in Corinth extended to upwards of a year and a half (Acts xviii. 1-11). The consequence of this was that an important Church was collected here, which Paul could afterwards address as entirely composed of Gentile Christians (1 Cor. xii. 2), although a not inconsiderable minority of Jews always belonged to it. It consisted, however, almost exclusively of the lower orders (1 Cor. i. 26 ff.),¹ though individuals of higher

¹ This has been often attributed to the fact that Paul, discouraged by the small success of his Athenian attempt to consort with Greek philosophy, strove after a particularly simple announcement of the gospel, which had no power to attract the more highly cultivated orders. But the leading maxims respecting his manner of preaching, which he develops in 1 Cor. ii. 1-5 and according to which he refuses on principle to deck it out with rhetoric and philosophy, were so deeply founded in his conception of the nature and operation of the message of salvation, that they were assuredly not the fruit of isolated experiences. That the gospel remained foolishness to the cultivated classes at Corinth, who

rank were certainly not wanting, for we afterwards hear of the chamberlain Erastus as a member of it (Rom. xvi. 23). For this reason Paul never allowed the Church to support him, but lived the whole time on the proceeds of his handicraft and on assistance sent by his beloved Philippians (1 Cor. ix. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 7, 9; Phil. iv. 15).

The chronological determination of the one and a half years that Paul laboured in Corinth is very uncertain. Suetonius does not specify the year of the Jewish edict, and whether the edict of the year 52, mentioned by Tacitus (*Ann.*, 12, 52), is the same, is very questionable. But even if the year 52 were certain, the statement that Aquila had recently (*προσφάτως*) come to Corinth (Acts xviii. 2) still leaves considerable scope. How long after the so-called Apostolic Council, generally put in 52 (§ 14, 3), Paul departed from Antioch, how long his visitation journey to Syria, Cicilia, and Lycaonia occupied, or the duration of his stay in Galatia, Philippi, and Thessalonica, we have no data to determine. The usual computation, at the date 53-54, is therefore quite uncertain, although, since Claudius died in 54, Paul's arrival in Corinth cannot be brought down beyond that year.

7. The ministry of Paul in Corinth seems also to have come to an end, indirectly at least, by the agitations against him of hostile Jews. It was probably Sosthenes, the new chief of the synagogue, who had him dragged before the tribunal and accused of spreading a religion that was unlawful. The proconsul at that time was Jun. Annæus Gallio, brother of the philosopher Seneca, who extols him for his benevolence. He dismissed the accusation as relating solely to disputed questions within Judaism; and the disappointed (probably Jewish) multitude made the chief ruler of the synagogue suffer for not bringing the case against the hated heretic to a more successful issue. The incident, however, appears to have led the Apostle to leave the city a few days after (Acts xviii. 12-17). In the harbour Cenchrea he took ship for Syria, after having first shorn his head in payment were spoiled by their rhetoricians and philosophers (1 Cor. i. 22 f.), was neither due to his manner of preaching, nor could his preaching alter it.

of a vow which he had probably made in case God gave him a blessing in his Corinthian mission and a safe return.¹ A landing was made at Ephesus, where Aquila and Priscilla were left behind, and where Paul too remained for a short time and began to preach in the synagogue. When pressed to remain he refused, promising only to come again with God's help. He took ship to Cesarea, went thence on a short visit to Jerusalem, and came back to Antioch, which he always regarded as his proper head-quarters (Acts xviii. 18-22).² The beginning of his literary activity in the two Thessalonian Epistles belongs, so far as we know, to his stay at Corinth.

§ 16. PAUL AS AN AUTHOR.

1. Subsequently to the end of the second century, thirteen Pauline Epistles have been handed down to us. Respecting

¹ There is certainly much in the language to favour the reference of *κείραμενος* in Acts xviii. 18 to Aquila; but in reality that is quite impossible, since no object whatever can be seen for mentioning the head-shaving of Aquila. It was Paul therefore who made the vow to let his hair grow till the fulfilment of his prayer had been accomplished, and now on taking ship without hindrance redeemed his vow. It is an empty assertion that this truly Jewish act of piety stands in contradiction to his doctrine of the law, since private vows of this kind were neither prescribed, nor could they be undertaken as a thing necessary to salvation. That it was fabricated in order to put the legal piety of Paul in prominent light, is excluded by the way in which it is presented, which does not even make it adequately clear that Paul is referred to.

² It is impossible that the journey to Jerusalem, referred to in xviii. 22 simply with *ἀναβας*, can have been invented in order to show Paul's zeal for the law and the good relation in which he stood to the primitive Church, for in that case it would have been more clearly set forth and more fully narrated. That it was a journey to a feast for which he thus shortened his stay at Ephesus is inferred solely from the clause added in xviii. 21, which is a palpable interpolation, according to xx. 16. On the other hand, it is obvious that he accompanied Silvanus to Jerusalem, whither the latter naturally returned after his journey had been accomplished; for although neither Silvanus nor Timotheus is mentioned after Acts xviii. 5, yet it is certainly taken for granted that both accompanied him on his departure from Corinth.

the Epistle to the Hebrews opinion has always been divided, hence it requires particular examination. The Epistle to Philemon is only mentioned incidentally by Tertullian, but we see from the Peshito and the Muratorian Canon that the reason of its not being quoted like the others is simply on account of the unimportant character of its theological contents (§ 9, 4). In any case, the three Pastoral Epistles are wanting in the earliest concluded collection of the Pauline Epistles by Marcion (§ 8, 6); but this fact has no importance whatever where ecclesiastical tradition is concerned, on account of the critical and eclectic manner of the Gnostic in question. It is a manifest error to suppose that the utterances of the Muratorian Canon with respect to these epistles (more correctly, to the four epistles all of which were addressed to separate individuals) contain an intimation that their genuineness was doubtful, or that their acceptance required special justification (§ 10, 2, note 2). It is in keeping with the history of the formation of the Canon, that before Theophilus and Irenæus, only one express citation is to be found in Athenagoras (§ 7, 7); and if the latter be an eschatological prediction of the Apostle taken from 1 Cor., the only express citation in Theophilus comes from the Pastoral Epistles themselves (§ 9, 4, note 1). Only Clement of Rome's first Epistle to the Corinthians and Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians (§ 6, 1) are specially mentioned from a definite motive.¹ Our thirteen epistles are therefore uniformly attested by ecclesiastical tradition. We arrive at the same result if we take into consideration the literary allusions before the time of Irenæus which attest the existence and use of these epistles. Though the Epistle to the Romans was so generally known, yet the use of it is not so striking as we should expect from the extent and importance of its contents. On the other hand, the first Epistle to the Corinthians seems decidedly to have been most freely used, at least till Justin, while of the second we

find only the weakest, scantiest and latest traces. Even the Galatian Epistle is by no means so freely used as to take precedence of the other smaller Paulines, which we should naturally not expect to be used like the three larger ones; but it is certain, at least in the time before Justin, that the Ephesian Epistle held quite a subordinate place as compared with the Colossian Epistle so nearly allied to it. Even the use of the Philippian Epistle, although it begins with Clement, does not at all correspond to the fact that it is expressly mentioned by Polycarp. With respect to the Thessalonian Epistles, we find far more numerous, more important and more certain allusions to the *second*. Above all, the use of the Pastoral Epistles is not by any means in keeping with the assumption that they are less certainly attested by tradition. We find them exercising an early and widely extended influence on ecclesiastical literature; nor is there any perceptible difference in the case of any one in frequency of usage, which is about proportioned to their length, on which account 1 Timothy has a certain prominence. For evidence of this compare § 6, 7; vii. 4, 7. It must be stated in the most definite way that we have no data in tradition for the criticism of the Pauline Epistles.

The Pauline Epistles first appear in Marcion as a closed collection, of whose succession we may now treat (§ 8, 6). In his list, Gal., Cor. (2), and Romans come first, then follow Thess. (2), Eph., Col., Phil., and finally, since the Pastoral Epistles are wanting, Philemon as the only private letter. Although the first four and the second five stand respectively in chronological order, it may be doubted whether this arrangement is intentional; for, since the Thessalonian Epistles are unquestionably the earliest, the first four and the second five would then be consciously separated as two distinct categories of Pauline Epistles, for which we have no foundation whatever in tradition. The Muratorian Canon (§ 10, 2) also, it is true, gives only the contents of the first four (in this order: Cor., Gal., Rom.), thus separating them from the rest and seeming to regard them as the most important, but it then proceeds to enumerate the Churches to which Paul wrote, in quite a different order (Cor., Eph., Phil., Col., Gal., Thess. Rom.). Since all

attempts to prove a definite succession in Tertullian are vain (§ 9, 4, note 2), we must look for this first in the Bible-manuscripts that were put together for the purpose of public reading in the Churches. But the earliest of these, from which the Peshito was translated, must have had the same order, with trifling exceptions (comp. the Cod. Clarom., which still puts Col. before Phil.), as our Greek Codd., which the lists of Athanasius, Amphilochius and others follow, and which we still retain (Rom., Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., Thess., Tim., Tit., Philem.). It is conceivable enough that the Roman Epistle should stand first among them, but that the rest are arranged according to their length, as Reuss, Ewald and especially Laurent (*Neutest. Stud.*, Gotha, 1866) assert, is very doubtful, because neither the position of Gal. before Eph., nor the separation of the contemporaneous Eph. and Col. by Philippians is explained in this way. We cannot give any certain explanation of this order.

2. It is not *à priori* very probable that all which Paul wrote has been preserved, considering the great dissimilarity in the spread and use of his writings perceptible in the time preceding Irenæus. It is just as little probable that a greater number of more important epistles has been lost. That the oldest among such as have been preserved were also in reality his first is more than probable, from some intimations which they contain (1 Thess. v. 27; 2 Thess ii. 15, 17 f.); and it is only certain that Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 9, and the Epistle to the Laodiceans mentioned in Col. iv. 16 have been lost.

Doctrinal bias alone can dispute the fact that the epistle mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 9 was written by Paul before our first to Corinth (comp. J. G. Müller, *de tribus Pauli itineribus Cor. susc.*, Basel, 1831, and also L. Schulze); and it is an entirely untenable hypothesis that it has been in any way incorporated with our Corinthian Epistles, even fragmentarily. On the contrary, the conjecture that an epistle was written by Paul between our first and second to the Corinthians does not commend itself to us, much less the opinion that it is still preserved in 2 Cor. x.-xiii. The Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians extant in Armenian, together with one from the Corinthians preceding it (ed. Wilkins, Amsterd., 1715; comp. Fabricius, *Cod. apocr. novi test.*, ii., pp. 666 ff.), has indeed been defended by Rinck as genuine (*das Sendschreiben der Kor., etc.*, Heidelberg, 1823), but is unquestionably a fabrication made up of Pauline phrases (comp. Ullmann in the *Heidelberg*).

Jahrb., 1823, 6). Nor does the conjecture that the epistle mentioned in Col. iv. 16 is contained in our so-called Ephesian Epistle, commend itself to us. The Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans (Fabr., *Cod. apocr. novi testamenti*, ii., p. 873; comp. Anger, *Ueber den Laodicenerbrief*, Leipzig, 1873), which was widely spread in the middle ages (§ 12, 5, note 2), is a flimsy compilation from the Colossian and Philippian Epistles. On the other hand it has been inferred, but without the least foundation, from Phil. iii. 1, that Epistles of Paul to the Philippians have been lost, and that the remains of a more copious letter to the Ephesians are found in Romans xvi. Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.*, 12) and Augustine (*Ep. 153, ad Maced.*) also mention a correspondence between Paul and Seneca which has been probably fabricated on the basis of Acts xviii. 12 (Fabr., *Cod. apocr. novi test.*, ii., pp. 892, ff. Comp. Gelpke, *de familiaritate quæ Paulo cum Seneca phil. interf. traditur*, 1813; and against modern French defenders of it, comp. Baur, *Seneca und Paulus*, in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Th.*, 1858, 2).

On the other hand the question suggests itself, whether the thirteen epistles, most of which were only attributed to Paul more than a century after his death, do actually proceed from him. We have already seen how improbable it is that in the second century, at a time when the authority of the apostles was not yet traced back to their written memorials, a great number of epistles should have been fathered on him (§ 7, 7). It is not impossible, however, that in the earlier time after Paul's death, when the need of apostolic direction or encouragement was still felt in his Churches, some of his pupils may have addressed the Churches in his name, as, according to 2 Thess. ii. 2, seems to have happened. Criticism was first directed against the Pastoral Epistles by Eichhorn and de Wette; and soon afterwards against the Epistle to the Ephesians and the second Epistle to the Thessalonians in particular. The Tübingen school, following Baur's example, rejected all the smaller epistles, excepting the four great doctrinal and polemic ones, viz. Romans (with the exception of chaps. xv. xvi.), Corinthians, and Galatians. But a reaction arose within the school itself, and 1 Thess., Phil., and Philem. were again assigned to the Apostle, even the Colossian

Epistle being wholly or partially defended by those who were still under the influence of the school. The subversive criticism of Bruno Bauer, who pronounced all the Pauline Epistles to be fabrications, has recently found new followers among the Dutch critics, especially Loman (*Kritik der paulinischen Briefe*, Berlin, 1850).

3. Paul did not write his letters with his own hand, but dictated them. In Romans xvi. 22, one Tertius, his amanuensis, sends greeting; and the way in which he expressly emphasizes the fact (Philem. 19) that he is writing with his own hand, undoubtedly shows that he did not usually do so. The most natural explanation of this is that he was unpractised in writing; for his hand, which was more accustomed to manage a tool than a pen, could only form large (and probably misshapen) letters (Gal. vi. 11). Much that is abrupt and incorrect in his manner of writing is most naturally explained on the assumption that he dictated. But the Apostle early felt the need of adding something in his own hand to the dictated epistle (2 Thess. iii. 17 f.), if only a closing benediction. It seems to have been the occurrence (No. 2) mentioned in ii. 2 that led him to put a sign of attestation to the epistle written by a strange hand, and he then made the resolve to do this in future with all his epistles. In the Epistle to the Galatians this postscript in his own hand became a most striking concluding warning and exhortation (vi. 11-18). In the first Epistle to the Corinthians Paul expressly characterizes the concluding words as written with his own hand (xvi. 21-24), and similarly in the Colossian Epistle (iv. 18). But it can hardly be doubted that he did the same in other Church-letters, even where he does not expressly notify it.¹

¹ But in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians we must not look for such a postscript in his own hand; in the Epistle to the Romans he could only have written the great concluding doxology (xvi. 25-27), and in the Ephesian Epistle the entire final benediction (vi. 23 f.). In

Our manuscripts agree on the whole in the form in which they have preserved the Pauline Epistles. It is only Weisse (*Beiträge zur Kritik der paul. Briefe*, ed. Sulze, Leipzig, 1867) and Hitzig (*Beiträge zur Kritik der paul. Briefe*, Leipzig, 1870) who have endeavoured to point out in several of them a series of interpolations, and Holsten seems inclined to follow them (*Das Evang. des Paulus*, Berlin, 1830); Ewald, after the example of earlier critics, has pronounced the paragraph 2 Cor. vi. 14–vii. 1 spurious; and such as have been unwilling entirely to reject the smaller epistles, have at least held that they were interpolated. Laurent (*Ntl. Stud.*) has endeavoured to separate a series of passages as later marginal remarks.

4. All thirteen epistles begin with an inscription, in which the current Greek epistolary introduction (*χαίρειν* or *χαίρειν λέγει*; comp. Jas. i. 1; Acts xxiii. 26) is expanded into a copious benediction which, departing from the proper address, takes the form of an independent sentence.¹ Paul here speaks of himself by name, but in the Thessalonian Epistles alone without some addition; in his only private letter he calls himself *δέσμιος Χρ. Ἰησ.* (Philem. 1), elsewhere generally an apostle, and with unmistakable refer-

the Epistle to the Philippians the greetings seem to have been written with his own hand (iv. 21–23) before the final benediction, on account of the *ἀμὴν* which precedes the latter, though this is not absolute proof (comp. Rom. xv. 33); so too, perhaps, in 2 Cor. xiii. 12 f. Of the letters to separate individuals, that to Philemon is most plainly stated to have been written with his own hand (19); it was certainly not the case with the rather copious Pastoral Epistles. In the first Epistle to Timothy the final exhortation (vi. 20 f.) might be from the hand of the Apostle as in Galatians, and the same thing may be said of the greetings with the benediction in the second (iv. 19–22), as well as in Philippians. The Epistle to Titus affords no such certain ground for the assumption of a postscript in his own hand, but it does not follow that he did not write it.

¹ This is done by the *χαρίς ὑμῶν καὶ εὐρήνη* in the benediction, and the only exception to it is in the Pastoral Epistles, where such repetition of the dative is wanting, because they are addressed to individuals, whereas in the Epistle to Philemon other persons besides the one addressed are named, and therefore the usual *χαρίς ὑμῶν* (1–3) follows. It is arbitrarily assumed that Paul was the creator of this epistolary form. It is certainly not found in James (comp. also 3 John 1), but appears in Peter's Epistles, Jude 1 f., 2 John 1–3, and above all in the Apocalypse i. 4.

ence to the origin of his apostleship, even gives himself this name in his official pastoral letters to Timothy and Titus; in his Epistles to the Romans and to Titus where this designation is followed by an exposition of the nature of his apostleship, referring to the contents of the epistle, he begins by speaking of himself in a more general way as $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\chi\rho. \text{ } \text{'}\eta\sigma.$ or $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (Rom. i. 1-5; Tit. i. 1-3). The reason why in the Philippian Epistle he styles himself simply $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\chi\rho. \text{ } \text{'}\eta\sigma.$, is that he there associates himself with Timothy. By making the benediction a separate thing, he does not, however, degrade the letter to a mere address, nor characterize himself as merely the writer of the letter and its readers as the recipients, but he is the sender of the benediction while the readers are its recipients. Hence it is that in this benediction he frequently joins the names of friends happening to be with him, especially Timothy, and extends it to others besides the immediate recipients.² The

² The person named along with him in the inscription cannot be the writer of the epistle, since in the only case in which we know the writer (No. 3), he is not named in the inscription; nor can he have been associated with him in writing it, as is generally assumed; this is quite conceivable with respect to the Thessalonian Epistles, where Silvanus and Timotheus, whom Paul named along with himself, were associated with him in founding the Church, and much that he addresses to it in the plural, may have been said in their joint names (comp. Laurent, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1861, 1); but even here he often speaks of himself in the first person, and of Timothy in the third. This view is impossible in the case of the Galatian Epistle where he emphasizes his apostolic authority so strongly, and says so much that is purely personal, though naming besides himself all the brethren who are with him (i. 2). It is equally inconceivable of the Corinthian Epistles, in the first of which he touches upon so many arrangements, with apostolic authority, and yet along with himself names the otherwise unknown Sosthenes; while in the second he names Timothy; but he treats of personal relations with such personal feeling, that to associate Timothy with himself in speaking of these things, or to discuss them in his name, is without meaning. In the Philippian Epistle he not only speaks of Timothy in the third person and says flattering things of him, but says so much of his own subjective frame of mind in captivity and towards the Church, that it is impossible to regard Timothy as a fellow-writer. In the only private letter,

benediction itself appears again in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians in the simplest form (*χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*); but the second already assumes the nature of a reflection on the source of the wished-for-thing in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (comp. Gal., Philem.), *ἡμῶν* being usually added after *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς* (Cor., Rom., Eph., Phil., comp. Col.).³ Paul's favourite way of beginning his epistle is with thanksgiving, in which he gratefully acknowledges all the good that God's grace has bestowed on his readers, frequently adding a petition for what still remains to be desired. Only in the Galatian Epistle does severe censure take its place, while in the second Epistle to the Corinthians a thanksgiving for the grace that has been manifested to him, in the form of an expression of gratitude for what God has enabled him to do for the Church, is substituted (ii. 14, ff.). In the Ephesian Epistle alone it is preceded by solemn praise of God for the Divine acts of salvation.

to Philemon, he also names Timothy together with himself and the person addressed, with whom the whole letter is concerned, besides a number of others, just as in the Corinthian letters the salutation extends beyond the circle of the recipients, the Philippian letter expressly including the officers of the Church. Moreover he designates the saluted sometimes as definite Churches (Thess., Gal., Cor.), sometimes as the Christians in a definite place (Rom., Col., Phil.), in both cases characterizing them as such more minutely.

³ It thus appears that even this benediction has by no means a stereotyped form throughout. In the Colossian Epistle, according to the corrected text, the *καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* is altogether wanting, while in the Galatian Epistle the *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χρ.* is followed by a reference to the saving work of Christ in relation to the contents of the epistle, which closes with a doxology (i. 3-5). In the Epistles to Timothy it runs thus: *χάρις, εἰλεος, εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*; in Titus: *χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θ. πατρ. καὶ Χρ. Ἰησ. τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*. Moreover this form of the Christian benediction, in which the purely Jewish Shalom is joined with the Christian wish for *χάρις*, is scarcely specifically Pauline, since the *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη* appears also in the Petrine Epistles and the Apocalypse, the reflection on the source of the wished-for-thing in God and Christ occurring in 2 John 3 and in the Apocalypse i. 4 etc., and *εἰλεος* in 2 John 3 and Jude 2.

Even in Philem. and 2 Tim. the thanksgiving is not wanting, while 1 Tim. and Titus begin at once with exhortation. As to the rest, the precise formula varies very much according to the occasion and object of the epistle. At most it may be said of the Apostle, that after disposing of the chief points of which he has to treat, he is fond of adding a number of general exhortations that have little or no connection with the main objects of the epistle. But these also vary exceedingly in substance and extent. On the other hand it is natural that all greetings, directions, recommendations, and other extraneous or personal matter, should come at the end; although this element is neither peculiar to the Pauline Epistles, nor does it characterize them in equal measure. The form of the conclusion too is not stereotyped, as may be seen from the very dissimilar way in which Paul is accustomed to put his own signature to the epistles (No. 3); nor even that of the final benediction in which it is his wont to invoke the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ on his readers.⁴

5. The fact that we have so rich a literary legacy from Paul is not by any means exclusively due to the circumstance that opportunities for epistolary communication presented

⁴ Already in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians we read: *ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν* (comp. Col. and 1 Tim.: *ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν*), in the second: *μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν* (comp. Titus: *ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*), and in the Galatian Epistle: *μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί· ἀμήν* (comp. Philem. and Phil.: *ἡ χάρις τ. κυρ. Ἰησ. Χρ. μετὰ τ. πνεύματος ὑμῶν*). In the first Epistle to the Corinthians the *ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν* is followed by an assurance of love to all; in the second, the full threefold apostolic blessing is substituted for the simple benediction, just as in the Roman Epistle, the great concluding doxology; in the Ephesian Epistle we find a double benediction, more copious in expression (vi. 23, f.); and in 2 Tim. it runs: *ὁ κύριος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου. ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν*. Only in the Apocalypse xxii. 21 do we find also the final benediction: *ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων* with its Pauline ring, and in Heb. xiii. 25 *ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*; while, on the other hand, 1 Pet. v. 14 and 3 John 15 have the familiar Jewish farewell.

themselves to him in the wide circle of his Churches and in his comprehensive activity, more frequently than to others. He had obviously inclination and capacity for literary activity; and the fact that it found expression only in letters must be attributed solely to circumstances. It was necessary for him to unfold his ideas, and in presenting them to become conscious of their close connection as well as all their grounds and consequences.¹ His Rabbinical schooling had taught him to establish a thesis dialectically on all sides, to prove it by refuting objections raised against it or anticipated by himself, to guard it against misunderstandings, and to explain it by copious argument. His logic is often somewhat artificial, so that it is difficult to follow the train of his reasoning. He makes use of Scriptural arguments for which his knowledge of Scripture supplied him with the richest material. Sometimes he employs Old Testament Scripture with great freedom of citation and combination, of explanation and application; again he plays on words in true Rabbinical fashion, or puts forward allegorical interpretations. But his literary skill is by no means shown merely in doctrinal details in the stricter sense, least of all in polemic or apologetic alone, but is equally manifest in his psychological analyses, his richly coloured pictures of pre-Christian or Christian conditions and forms of life and the religious and historical disquisitions connected therewith, as also in his deep grasp and copious development of the fulness of salvation contained in the great fundamental facts of the gospel. His exhortation, by which the doctrinal argument is frequently interrupted in the most lively way, is inexhaustible in its revelation of the deepest and richest motives, and in tracing them up to the facts of salvation.

¹ Whatever opinion may be held as to the aim of the Epistle to the Romans, it must be admitted that it goes far beyond its proximate purpose; moreover, its doctrinal discussions have frequently no relation whatever to the simple motive that called them forth.

He knows also how to appropriate the form of Jewish wisdom; maxim follows maxim, short, disconnected, with the greatest diversity of form, and wanting in strict arrangement. The last characteristic is most strikingly seen wherever he falls into descriptions and enumerations of virtues and faults, of the conditions of life and work. But it is certain that we never find the cold objectivity of the author, because the living warmth of the letter-writer throbs in all his epistles. Hence the frequent addresses, the ever-recurring questions with which he draws out his details. Paul is able powerfully to move, but also to lift up and comfort; high moral earnestness is always associated in him with depth of religious feeling, which often finds vent in inspired utterance. He is not without passion, he lashes the weaknesses and errors of his readers without pity, he is able mortally to wound his opponents, and does not even despise the weapons of irony and satire. But the softest tones of the mind are likewise at his disposal, the ebullition of righteous anger softens down to the most touching expression of heartfelt love, he can speak the language of deeply wounded love as well as of the most ardent longing, of exulting gratitude as well as suppressed pain. He knows how to win with delicate tact and patient tenderness; and in intercourse with a friend does not even despise the clever jest.²

A Vatican MS. contains the notice that the rhetorician Longinus concluded an enumeration of the great orators with Paul of Tarsus, who might even be pronounced the first (comp. Nagel, *de judicio Longini*, Altdorf, 1772). The genuineness of this citation is very doubtful; at all events, the judgment rests on a complete mistake. Paul himself definitely repudiated all striving after rhetorical art as well as philosophic culture (§ 13, 3, note 2). What was formerly written *de Pauli eloquentia* (Kirchmaier, 1695; Baden, 1786) or of a *Logica* and *Rhetorica*

² It is clear how impossible it is in the case of one so richly endowed with intellect, whose every epistle and group of epistles show the greatest diversity of form and substance, to prove the spuriousness of a writing from the relatively new form of its composition.

Paulina (Bauer, Halle, 1774, 82), is a mistake. The thing that is so taking in Paul's epistles is their substance and living warmth, not their form. His antitheses and paradoxes, his play on words and ideas, show the riches and fineness of his intellect, but are not artificial means; his images, often indicated but cursorily, and applied almost without the consciousness of their imagery, frequently drawn out even into copious allegories, and in many cases strangely intermixed, want rhetorical purity and moderation in their carrying out.

6. The fact that the Apostle has rounded off his view of salvation in Christ almost to the completeness of a system, is closely connected with his literary giftedness. But to suppose that his views took this mature form all at once on his conversion, is quite unhistorical. It is true that the life he had been leading, which terminated in his conversion, and the individual experience of salvation he made on this occasion, must have had a certain influence on the development of his views; but since in the nature of things he could only be gradually awakened to the need of becoming conscious on all sides of the close continuity of the new saving truth that had been opened up to him, as well as of the premises it implied and the conclusions to which it led, it follows that the means which led him more and more exclusively to the Gentile mission, and the necessity of establishing and securing freedom from the law to his Gentile Christian Churches in opposition to the pretensions of Jewish-Christian zealots, first drove him to perfect on all sides and to establish on a firm basis, the peculiar character of his saving announcement, his profound conception of Christianity as a new dispensation of grace and its relation to the Old Testament revelation of salvation and of the law.¹ Hence it is *à priori* a great mis-

¹ A comparison of the Corinthian Epistles with Galatians and Romans shows unanswerably that the doctrine of justification, with all its presuppositions and consequences, developed in the great struggle-period of his life, by no means exhausted the entire range of his Christian views or determined it exclusively; and yet it is only where personal certainty of salvation is concerned that we can speak of a systematic perfection. The doctrine of the person of Christ and of the saving significance of His death,

take on the part of the Tübingen school to make the doctrinal system of the great doctrinal and polemic Epistles the criterion whereby to prove which of all the Pauline epistles that have been handed down to us is genuine. And the mistake is only aggravated if, by recognising the first Thessalonian Epistle, or that to the Philippians, the principle be conceded that a view so much less fully developed as appears in the former, or one so peculiarly unfolded in many ways as is to be found in the latter, may be Pauline, and yet where other epistles are in question a want of accuracy in the form of that system of doctrine be regarded as a sign that they are not of Pauline origin. In the case of an intellect so largely capable of development as that of the Apostle, no new departure or relative change of theological views can surprise, or lead to a hasty condemnation of the writings which contain them as spurious. This could only happen if the traces of the religious experiences he made should anywhere be found to be extinct; or ideas directly at variance with those arising out of such experiences be found to have been adopted. For so certainly as Paul is the theologian proper among the apostles, so certainly is it an utter misconception to regard him as the author and advocate of a doctrinal system which owed its origin to speculative and not specifically religious motives.

7. The view formerly maintained by Bolten (in his translation of the New Testament Epistles) and Bertholdt, that Paul originally wrote his epistles in Aramaic, refutes itself. As a Hellenist he spoke Greek from his childhood, read the Old Testament in the translation of the LXX. (comp.

of the Church and its development towards the consummation at hand, is in these epistles only touched upon in incidental utterances capable of much richer and fuller development; and his views of the reorganization of the life-relations of the natural man, by the Spirit of Christ, are visibly checked in their development by the preponderance of the purely religious interest and by the conception of the close proximity of the second coming.

Kautsch, *de V. T. locis a P. ap. allegatis*, Lips., 1869), and during his Gentile Christian ministry remained in constant intercourse with Greek-speaking people.¹ It was not indeed classical Greek that he wrote, since he was a stranger to Greek literature (§ 13, 3), but the language of the people and of common life (certainly allied to the *κοινή*), which was essentially influenced by the LXX. in its expression of religious ideas and conceptions. His language is therefore wanting in classical correctness, in the rich usage of particles and in fineness in the application of moods, as well as in artistic structure of periods. His sentences flow on irregularly by means of constantly recurring participles or subjoined relatives; or they become overladen with new explanatory prepositions and inserted relative clauses; where he aims at a more fully developed periodic structure, he readily founders, the thread being lost in lengthened parentheses and the discourse broken off irregularly. A constant struggling of idea with form, the influx of new thoughts and fresh relations that he desires to put forward, deprive the language of proportion and finish. Again, the discourse advances in short clauses connected by the slightest particles, then breaks off; the language, abrupt and elliptical even to obscurity, changing capriciously and having no uniformity whatever. From this we see plainly that it is hazardous to speak of a Pauline style (comp. J. Hoffmann, *de stilo Pauli*, Tüb., 1757). The subjects on which he writes are too varied, the moods that influence him too changing, while the freedom of the epistolary form hinders all approach to a fixed and characteristic style. On the other hand, Paul certainly created for

¹ His epistles too are collectively addressed partly to Greek-speaking persons, even the Epistle to the Romans, for Rome had long been an *urbs Græca*, as the whole Christian literature emanating from Rome and addressed to Rome, shows. Hence the view of Harduin, Bellarmin, Corn. à Lapide, and others, that this epistle, or perhaps all the rest, were originally written in Latin, is a tendency-fiction on behalf of the Vulgate, which even Catholic theologians have long since abandoned.

himself a distinctly marked doctrinal phraseology; his strict dialectic, as well as his leaning to sharp formula, and the need to establish his position firmly in the struggle of opposites determined its form. But even this was by no means peculiar to him from the first; and in many points we can still follow its gradual development. Above all, the great doctrinal and polemic epistles show that he was never fettered by it and never made it a mechanical habit; and there are parts where he uses great freedom of expression, scarcely showing a trace of his peculiar style; occasionally we find even a change to a more specifically Christian and a more general religious-moral mode of expression. This shows what a mistake it was to make the proportion in which his technical doctrinal language appears, a criterion for the criticism of the epistles handed down as Pauline.² To make the four principal epistles the categorical standard of his lexical phraseology in so far as it was not directly influenced by his doctrine, and to measure all that claims to be of Pauline origin by them, is a manifest blunder. Each one of the epistles shows a fulness of hapaxlegomena, many different expressions for the same thing, and manifold points of contact with other New Testament writings; for the linguistic treasure from which they all drew was essentially the same. The four epistles certainly show a number of peculiar and favourite expressions, but they are closely allied in time and move in a kindred circle of thought corresponding to the circumstances of their origin. But even here we see how readily this or that favourite expression may be entirely absent from a comprehensive epistle, and how little such absence justifies a conclusion as to spuriousness!

² Having been formed in the struggle-period and for its needs, it recedes of itself so soon as the oppositions that called it forth recede or disappear. It is quite at variance with the wealth of Paul's intellect to suppose that he could not have developed new forms of expression if the appearance of new oppositions had led to new advances of his doctrinal views.

The proofs for the distribution of the lexical vocabulary among the various epistles which defies all computation, are furnished by the concordance in the case of each given letter. Under *a* the Epistle to the Romans shows 20 hapaxlegomena; 1 Cor. 24, 2 Cor. 14, the Epistle to the Galatians only 1. But to these must be added 8, 4, 3 and 1 words respectively that each of the epistles has in common with certain later ones; 21, 23, 7 and 8 that each respectively has in common with other N. T. writings; and 16, 5, 4, 0, which each has in common with both; so that Romans has 65, 1 Cor. 56, 2 Cor. 28, and Gal. 10 words which are not in the other epistles; while Romans and 1 Cor. have almost an equal number of substantives and verbs, 2 Cor. has more substantives, Gal. almost exclusively verbs, and 1 Cor. more adjectives than substantives. Among these are to be found words such as *ανακρινειν*, which occurs ten times in Corinthians, *απειθειν* appearing 5 times in Romans, and several that are to be found 3 times in one epistle (comp. especially *ανεσις* in 2 Cor.). On the other hand we cannot be surprised that the Thessalonian Epistles show 4+2; Eph. 8; Col. 11; Phil. 8; 1 Tim. and 2 Tim. 17 each; Tit. 5; and Philem. 2 hapaxlegomena. To these may be added respectively 6+3, 7, 3, 8, 8+2, 2, and 1, which each of the epistles has exclusively in common with other N. T. writings; and 4+4, 7, 1, and 1 which they respectively share with later epistles, so that, as compared with the older epistles, 1 Thess. has 14, 2 Thess. 9, Eph. 22, Col. 15, Phil. 17, 1 Tim. 25, 2 Tim. 19, Tit. 7, and Philem. 4 characteristic words; while Eph. and Col. have almost as many substantives as verbs, 1 Tim. most substantives, Thess. and Phil. most verbs, 2 Tim. and Tit. a great preponderance of adjectives. Frequently a word appears only in two of the four great epistles; Rom. shares 31 with 1st and 2nd Cor., 10 with Gal., 1st and 2nd Cor. 13 with each other, while Corinthians and Gal. have 8 in common. Among these 62, 2 (*αντιμισθια, αμεταμελητος*) are nowhere else to be found in the New Testament, 5 (*αγαθωσυννη, αγιωσυννη, απλοτης, αφθαρσια, απειναι*) only in Paul, 14 only in other writings, and 21 in both. In like manner, Eph. and Col. have 8 words in common (5 *απ. λεγ.*), and the Pastoral Epistles 10 (7 *απ. λεγ.*). On the other hand, of the words that occur in the other epistles, 2 are wanting in Rom., 5 in 1 Cor., 11 in 2 Cor., and 14 in Gal. Of these, 2 are only to be found in the Pastoral Epistles (*αφορμη, ατιμια*), 7 are current with Paul (*ακαθαρσια, ακροβυστια, αναθεμα, αποστολη, αδοκιμος, αλαττειν, απεκδεχεσθαι*), while 23 frequently appear everywhere else. Thus Romans is deficient in such words as *αλλος, αδικειν*; 1 Cor. *αγαθος, αιωνιος*, 2 Cor. *αιμα, αποκαλυπτειν, αγειν, αρεσκειν*, Gal. *αδικια, αναγκη, αγαπητος, αγιος, αφρων, ασπαζεσθαι, απολλυναι, ασθενειν*. Among the words that occur in all four epistles, only *αρα ον* is found exclusively in Paul, while *αγνοειν* is frequent with him, and both appear in the later Paulines. From this we may judge how little significance can be attributed to the fact that in the Philippian Epistle *αμαρτια* is wanting, in 1 Thess. (Philem.) *αληθεια*,

in 2 Thess. (Philem.) *αποστολος*, in Tit. *αδελφος*, in Philem. *ανθρωπος*, in both Thessalonian Epistles (Philem.) *αιων*, in both Epistles to Timothy (Philem.) *αλληλων*, in 1 Thess. and 1 Tim. *ακουειν*; in Phil., 1 Tim., Tit., and Philem. *αγαπαι*, and in Eph., Philem., and the Pastoral Epistles the *αυ* so frequent in Paul.

§ 17. THE THESSALONIAN EPISTLES.

1. The first Epistle to the Thessalonians puts us back into the time when Paul had worked a few weeks in Corinth, and Timothy had just come to him with Silas (Acts xviii. 5; comp. 1 Thess. i. 1, iii. 6). The time of his ministry in Thessalonica is still vividly present to his mind, the founding of a Gentile Christian Church there is still new, and is much talked of in Christian circles everywhere (i. 8 f.); the Apostle still feels as if robbed of his children, and has repeatedly purposed to return to them (ii. 17 f.). At last he sends Timothy from Athens, to strengthen them, and it is this journey from which the latter had just returned (iii. 1-6).¹ The accounts which he had brought of the faith and life of the Church were in the main joyful (i. 3). The Church had held their teacher in good remembrance and longed in their heart to see him again (iii. 6), in the much frequented commercial city they had had many opportunities of showing by hospitality their love to the Macedonian brethren (iv. 10). But the pressure of affliction under which they suffered from the beginning (i. 6, ii. 14), had visibly increased rather than diminished; they had to suffer severe persecutions from their heathen countrymen,

¹ The error, founded on a misunderstanding of iii. 1, that this epistle was written in Athens, as old subscriptions put it, has been revived by Böttger (*Beiträge zur histor. krit. Einl. in die paulin. Schriften*, Göttingen, 1837) and Wurm (*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theol.*, 1883, 1). Schrader and Köhler (*Versuch über die Abfassungszeit der apostol. Schriften, etc.*, Leipzig, 1830) have put the Epistle much later; the former, because Paul had already visited the Church repeatedly at the time of Acts xx. 2 f. The latter, by a false interpretation of ii. 16, puts it even after the breaking out of the Jewish war.

and this had made many feeble-minded and dispirited (v. 14, 16 f.). Moreover, the unbelieving Jews tried to persuade them that they were led astray by cunning, ambitious and self-seeking deceivers, who, after having set those whom they had deceived entirely at enmity with their countrymen, for their own part had fled at the right moment to escape from righteous punishment.² Whether much or little regard was paid to such insinuations, yet by this means the Church was roused to keener susceptibility to the enmity in which it was involved on account of its new faith. But so much the more did it cling under present oppression to the Christian hope of the future which held out a prospect of release from all trouble, at the second coming of the Lord. Paul had indeed announced the speedy approach of it, and hoped to live to see it himself; nor were prophets wanting in the Church, who, in a superabundance of Christian inspiration, described the glory of the kingdom of God that was at hand (v. 19 f.). But the more they occupied themselves with these questions respecting the last things, which always attract the curiosity of immature believers, so much the more did the excitement of the Church increase. It reached such a pitch that many, waiting for the near event and professedly preparing only for it, gave up their civic employments, and so became a burden on the beneficence of

² That the apologetic details of the second and third chapters, interpreted by de Wette, Bleek, and Lünemann simply as naïve outpourings of the heart, pre-suppose calumnies of this nature, is at the present day more and more universally acknowledged. They can neither have proceeded from Jewish Christians, a conclusion to which, however, Lipsius comes in the main (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1854, 4), since there could scarcely have been a considerable or influential number of such in Thessalonica (§ 15, 4), nor from Gentiles, as Hofmann and v. Soden (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1885, 2) suppose, but solely from unbelieving Jews, who claimed to know their countrymen only too well, as plainly appears from the polemic joined with his apology and directed against the Jews as enemies of the gospel (ii. 14-16). Comp. Hilgenfeld, Hausrath, Sabatiez, and especially P. Schmidt, *der erste Thessalonicherbrief*, Berlin, 1885.

the Church, or even on their heathen countrymen (iv. 11 f., v. 14). Their fanatical conduct naturally called forth on the other side cold criticism by which prophetic inspiration was despised; subtle disputes arose respecting the time and hour of Christ's second coming (v. 1 f., 19 f.), instead of earnest preparation for it. The rulers of the Church, who endeavoured to repress the disorder on both sides, could not maintain their authority (v. 12 f.). Lastly, the first deaths had taken place in the young Church, and had deeply stirred their minds, because those who died so prematurely appeared to lose the glory coming in with the second advent of the Lord (iv. 13 f.). From all this we understand why the Apostle speaks of the imperfect faith of those whom he would so willingly have helped by a new visit (iii. 10); moreover their moral life presented the image of a Church that was still young and unconsolidated. The Christian brotherly love for which he so highly commends them, was to increase and abound (iii. 12, iv. 10); and although he acknowledges that they knew his instructions as to the Christian walk and made them their guiding principle (iv. 1 f.), yet his earnest warnings against the cardinal heathen vices of unchastity and avarice (iv. 3-8), show that their practice still left much to be desired. It was these conditions of the Church, as known to Paul through the communications of Timothy, that moved him to write his first epistle.

2. With gratitude to God Paul speaks of their present state of faith; but in expressly emphasizing his certainty of their election owing to the Divine working of his preaching in them, and the exemplary way in which, after his example and that of the Lord, they had received the word in much affliction (i. 3-7), his object is, by this reference to the Divine origin of their Christian state, to strengthen them to persevere in it, just as his allusion to the world-wide fame of their conversion from heathenism to Christianity is

meant to encourage them to maintain their good reputation (i. 8-10). He then turns to the calumnies by which some had sought to discredit the work of God's messengers among them. The apostle calls to mind how the bitter experiences he had just made at Philippi, and the severe struggles amid which he began his work among them, were not adapted to give him joy in his ministry if he had not been divinely commissioned to bring them a message from God (ii. 1 f.). To prove that it was not a delusion, and that he did not preach to them from impure motives or in unrighteous ways, he appeals to the fact that he did not deceive them with flattering words, nor sought gain or honour from men, but proclaimed the gospel with the tenderest self-sacrificing love, while earning his bread laboriously by the work of his hands (ii. 3-9). He calls them and God to witness how he had worked among them even after their conversion, with fatherly love, and reminds them once more how they had received his word as the word of God, and had experienced its efficacy, since it had made them strong to endure the enmity of their countrymen as steadfastly as the primitive Church had suffered that of the Jews (ii. 10-16).¹ When he goes on to describe how he had longed from the beginning to return to those who were his joy and crown of glory, and had only been hindered by the continued enmity of the adversary (ii. 17-20), how he could have no rest until he had parted with

¹ But when in this connection he points to the Jews as the special enemies of Christ and His gospel (ii. 15 f.), he undoubtedly refers to the fact that such calumnies proceeded from them, and that by means of these they sought to disturb his work among the Gentiles. The *ἐφθάσεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ἀργὴ εἰς τὸ εὖλος*, from which false conclusions were formerly drawn respecting the date of the epistle, neither points to the destruction of Jerusalem, from which Baur inferred the spuriousness of the epistle, nor to all the excesses of the procuratorship in Judea contemporary with our epistle (W. Grimm, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1850, 4), much less to the edict of Clandius *de pellendis Judæis*, to which P. Schmidt has lately referred it, but to the increasing obduracy of the people in which the wrath of God against Israel was consummated, as v. Soden has rightly perceived.

his companion, preferring to remain alone that they might be comforted under the afflictions he had foretold (iii. 1-5), it is clear that this is directed against the calumny that represented him as having by cowardly flight escaped the persecutions he had not expected, leaving them to their misery without concern. He himself in his present abode is in like affliction and distress; but the good news brought by Timothy have given him new life and roused him to fervent gratitude towards God, joined with the constant prayer that God would lead him to them again, and would in the meantime strengthen and perfect them for the coming of the Lord (iii. 6-13).² It is only by way of supplement that he goes on to remind them of the instructions he had given them respecting the Christian life, especially with regard to keeping themselves pure from the specifically heathen vices of unchastity and covetousness (iv. 1-8). Of brotherly love he does not find it necessary to speak, and would not speak of it except to admonish them to procure the means for exemplifying it by diligent labour, instead of making Christianity a disgrace before the heathen by idleness and begging (iv. 9-12). The way in which he proceeds to instruct them respecting the last things shows beyond a doubt that it was the restless occupation with questions of eschatology, and the morbid excitement thus induced, that had led many to give up regular work. It is evident that Paul, who himself thought the advent of the Lord to be so close at hand, did not enter more minutely into the question as to what should become of those who might die in the interval; and what he may possibly have said of the resurrection at the second coming found no proper sympathy, owing to the antipathy of the Greek mind against this very idea (comp.

² The solemn prayer with which this first part of the epistle concludes, as well as the junction of what follows with *λαίπων οὖν* (iv. 1), show without doubt that far from being an introduction, it contains the chief thing which the Apostle has to say to the Thessalonians.

Acts xvii. 32). For this reason he first explains that it is founded in faith in the resurrection of Christ and in His word,³ that at the second coming of Christ the dead members of the Church shall first be raised, and thus be put quite on a par with those who survive, in order to be taken by the Lord into His glory (iv. 13-18). With respect to the question as to the time of the second advent, which would certainly come suddenly and unawares, he contents himself with an exhortation to earnest preparation for it (v. 1-11). So too in the general concluding admonitions (v. 12-22), there are frequent echoes of the special relations to which the epistle refers, although they undoubtedly go beyond the latter.⁴ After a full-toned benediction, the fulfilment of which he seals with an Amen, Paul commends himself to the intercession of his readers (v. 23-25). It is apparent that the epistle was handed over to the rulers of the Church; for it is to them that the Apostle turns with the direction to greet all the brethren with a holy kiss, charging them to have his epistle read before a full meeting of the Church,

³ This word of the Lord is certainly not on the whole what was said by Him respecting His coming, as v. Soden still maintains, but that which is preserved in Matt. iv. 21; for if at the return of the Lord all His elect should be gathered together about Him, those already dead cannot be excluded, but must rather have been first raised up. Whilst Steck (*Jahrb. für prot. Theol.*, 1883, 4), thinks he discovers in it the words of 4th Ezra v. 41 etc., he infers from the use of this book the spuriousness of our epistle. But a reminiscence of Matt. xxiv. 43 is manifestly contained in v. 2 also.

⁴ Compare particularly v. 15-22. But in v. 12 f. the peace of the Church is evidently made to depend on due respect for the rulers of the Church; the *δρακτοι* whom Paul exhorts the Church to warn, are unquestionably those fanatical idlers; but the feeble-minded and weak to whom the exhortation to constant joy, prayer, and thankfulness is particularly addressed, are those who are bowed down by the suffering state of the Church, and made to waver (v. 14 f.). The admonition not to quench or despise prophetic inspiration but to prove it (v. 19 f.), carries us directly into the Church-gatherings excited by eschatological prophesyings.

upon which the final blessing follows (v. 26 f.). This arrangement seems to point to the fact that Paul began his epistolary intercourse with the Churches by this letter, and had therefore to give directions as to what use should be made of it.

3. When Baur in his *Paulus* (1845) pronounced the epistle to be spurious, after the solitary precedent of Schrader, he had some support in the prevailing exegetical view regarding it. If the first three chapters were actually to be looked upon as mere outpourings of the heart and retrospective, they seem to have just as little motive as the Jewish polemic (ii. 14-16) by which they were interrupted, and the short exhortations and occasional eschatological teachings in chaps. iv., v., such as are elsewhere subordinate in the Pauline Epistles, must form the chief object of this epistle, which therefore does certainly seem to be without sufficient motive or independent meaning. But if the historical occasion of the epistle be rightly estimated, it is a highly characteristic monument of the time when the Apostle encounters no other opposition than that of a slandering and persecuting Judaism, frustrating and undermining his activity among the heathen by every means in its power, as we learn from the account of his Macedonian mission given in the Acts (§ 15). The picture of a Christian Church that is still young, and much admired for the enthusiasm with which it had received the gospel, though depressed by sorrowful experiences, deeply agitated by eschatological questions, and still lacking in the attainment of the Christian spirit in practical life, that meets us in the epistle, is true to nature, and bears in itself the stamp of its genuineness; while Baur's attempt to prove that it contains opposing elements and points to a longer duration of the Church, is vain. His view, that the epistle is manifestly dependent on the Acts throughout, is refuted by the fact that the narrative of the latter is frequently supplemented

and corrected from the epistle in question (§ 15, 4). Subsequently (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1885, 2) Baur laid special stress on the fact that the epistle was copied from those to the Corinthians, which however do not exhibit a single parallel passage, such as we find in the Roman and Galatian Epistles, and have moreover many points of contact with the Corinthians from the nature of the subject.¹ Besides peculiar idioms, such as appear in every epistle and contain nothing anti-Pauline, we find the most striking resemblances in thought and expression to the other Pauline Epistles, and especially to the Corinthian Epistles, as P. Schmidt and v. Soden in particular have exhaustively shown. But above all there is no definite tangible motive for the view that the epistle is a fabrication, since it does not give prominence to the apostolic authority of Paul even in the address, but names him along with Silvanus and Timotheus.² Finally the exhortation to

¹ Both are addressed to Christian Churches essentially Gentile, that had to be warned against the cardinal vices of the heathen, and had no knowledge of the doctrine of the resurrection; both congregations were successively taken from the lower classes, for which reason Paul refused the support of the Church in both cases; in both epistles Paul naturally expresses himself in the same way of the manner of his activity and its results, of his love and longing for them; in both the personal suspicions to which he was subjected, in the one case from the Jews, in the other from the Jewish Christians, revert to the same point. Other things, such as the repeated wish to return to them, and again his altered plans of journey, the sending of Timothy here and of Titus there, his solicitude about the condition of the Church in the one place, and the impression made by his epistle in the other place, are brought into tendency-parallelism only in an artificial way.

² This could only consist in the eschatological discussions, or since v. 1-11 contains but practical admonitions with a view to the second coming the time of which was uncertain, in iv. 13-18; although even here the common Christian eschatological expectations are reproduced. But this very section does not presuppose that an entire Christian generation was already deceased, in which case believers must have been long familiar with the idea that many would not live to see the second coming, but that the Church was disturbed by the first cases of death that occurred in it. Nor could a later writer have possibly attributed to the Apostle the expectation that he would still survive the second advent (iv. 15),

read the letter to the assembled Church (v. 27) is quite intelligible in the case of a first epistle of the Apostle; but if made to refer to its official ecclesiastical reading, would put the epistle at the end of the second century, a time when nobody supposes that it was written.

Since Grimm and Lipsius (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1850, 4; 1854, 4), defended the epistle against Baur whom Volkmar followed, and Hilgenfeld also persistently upheld its genuineness in opposition to him, the question is looked upon by the later critical school as settled (comp. Weisse, Haus-rath, Pfeiderer, Holtzmann in Schenkel's *Bibellex.*, v., 1875, Immer), Holsten alone (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1877, 4), still finding united Paulinism in the Trilogy i: 3 (comp. also Steek, No. 2, note 3). Its genuineness has again recently (1885) been defended at length by P. Schmidt and v. Soden. But they labour in vain to refute the idea that it contains an undeveloped form of Pauline doctrine. Just as certainly as Christianity already appears here as the Divine dispensation of grace in which, by means of the gospel, faith is awakened in the elect, who through the sanctification effected by the Spirit of God are prepared for salvation at the second advent, so certainly are all doctrinal mediations of these saving facts lacking. As certainly as Christ is represented as the Divine Lord from whom, just as from God Himself, all salvation proceeds, so certainly is there a lack of all more definite utterances respecting the person of Christ, the saving meaning of His death for us (v. 10), and the form of the final completed salvation that He brings with Him at His second advent. Of the inability of the natural man to work out his own salvation, of the seat of sin in the flesh, of justification by grace or of community of life with Christ mediated by His Spirit, of the position of the Christian as regards the law, or of the Apostle's profound reflections on the relation of Christianity to Judaism and heathenism, we have not a word, although the way in which the Jews thrust themselves in between him and his Gentile Christians gave ample occasion for such mention. If therefore this epistle be regarded as genuine, the view that Paul had his whole system of doctrine substantially complete from the beginning, is absolutely excluded. Whoever finds a lack of all that proves itself Pauline in the great doctrinal and polemic epistles, cannot consistently hold this epistle to be genuine.

4. We do not know how long a time had elapsed since the first letter of the Apostle, when Paul again received news from Thessalonica that led him to write a *second*. But since after the fact that he belonged to those who died before it, had long been certainly known.

Silvanus and Timotheus were still with him (2 Thess. i. 1), he must have been in Corinth; and iii. 2 points so definitely to a hostile threat of decisive importance, that we are most naturally led to think of the complaint made by the Jews before the proconsul (Acts xviii. 12 ff.). The Church had made gratifying progress in faith and love, and had been most commendably patient in persecution (2 Thess. i. 3 ff.); but the weight of affliction under which it suffered, gave rise to ever new depression. Hence the Apostle had to remind them that the very severity of the conflict with their enemies was a guarantee of the approaching righteous judgment of God which was to bring them release from all their trouble (i. 5 ff.), when their heavenly Lord should come again to judge the heathen and all the enemies of the gospel (i. 7 ff.), and to be glorified in His saints; in which glory he prays that they may participate (i. 10-12). On the other hand, the very pressure of persecution had given a morbid stimulus to the hope of the near approach of the second advent. Prophets had arisen in the Church who proclaimed the immediate coming of the great day of the Lord, appealing for confirmation of their announcement to words spoken by Paul, or even to epistles said to have been written by him (ii. 1 f.), so that it was necessary for the Apostle to remind them how he had told them before, that the second coming of Christ would be preceded by the climax of godlessness concentrated in a person, kept back, as they were aware, by a restraining power (ii. 3-7). But in order to prevent new disquietude to which this prospect might possibly give rise, he lays stress on the fact that the appearance of Christ would put an immediate end to his adversary; the only object of whose coming was by his seductive arts to make the unbelieving ripe for judgment (ii. 8-12). They on the other hand were appointed to salvation and to glory, if they only held fast to what he had taught them by word and epistle; to which end he invokes

comfort and strength from the Lord on their behalf (ii. 13-17). He then commends himself to their intercession in the dangers by which he is threatened, and once more gives expression to his full confidence that they would remain true to his exhortations, desiring that they might have the assistance of the Lord (iii. 1-5). But he could not cherish this confidence in respect of every individual. The morbid excitement of those who left their civil employment was raised to a still higher pitch by the enhanced expectation of the second advent; and in spite of the exhortations of the first epistle, they had not returned to their work (iii. 6-12). The Apostle had therefore no alternative but to admonish the Church to withdraw from all intercourse with these disobedient members, in order by shunning them to bring them back, not however intending by this to prohibit brotherly admonition afterwards as well as before (iii. 13-16). But in order to prevent all improper use, such as had been made of epistles alleged to have been written by him (ii. 2), he here found it necessary for the first time to authenticate his letter by a postscript in his own hand (iii. 17 f., comp. § 16, 3).¹

5. Doubts as to the genuineness of this epistle, to which Chr. Schmidt in his *Introduction* (1804) first gave currency, were entertained by de Wette in the earlier editions of his *Introduction*; but after the exhaustive refutations by Guericke (in his *Beiträge*) and Reiche (*Authenticia Poster. ad Thess. Epist.*, Gött., 1829) he withdrew them. Kern was the

¹ After the example of Grotius, Ewald endeavoured to prove in his *Jahrb. f. bibl. Wissenschaft* (3, 1851), that the so-called second Epistle to the Thessalonians was written first probably in Berea, and was followed by Laurent (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1864, 3). But in the first epistle Paul addresses a newly founded Church; he here boasts of its further development; in the former he speaks quite freely of the nearness of the second coming, in the latter he already considers it necessary to obviate a misunderstanding of this expectation; the direction to punish those who remained disobedient here follows the warning against a disorderly life. ii. 15 obviously presupposes that the Church had already received written instructions, and ii. 1 refers back to 1 Thess. iv. 17.

first to make another and a more incisive attack on the epistle (*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theol.*, 1839, 2); but while formerly ii. 2, iii. 17 had been regarded as a ground for throwing suspicion on the first epistle, he looked upon the second rather in the light of an attempted imitation of the first. He already brought together in substance all that is even now adduced against it—alleged un-Pauline words and forms of expression (such as εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφειλομεν and the frequent use of κύριος instead of θεός), the unskilful exaggerations of the first epistle and other grounds of suspicion that vanish of themselves before impartial exegesis (comp. against him Pelt in the *Theolog. Mitarbeiten*, 1874, 2). Baur in his *Paulus* (1845) attached himself mainly to him, while asserting still more emphatically that the eschatological passage in chap. ii. had admitted Jewish ideas of the time to a greater extent than was the case with Paul, and contravened the natural expectation of the nearness of the second coming implied in 1 Cor. xv. (comp. on the other hand Grimm, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1850, 4). Subsequently (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1855, 2) he regarded this second epistle rather as an imitation of the Corinthian letters; and adopting the view of Grotius and Ewald (No. 4, note 1), looked upon our first epistle as an imitation of it from a later standpoint. On the other hand, Hilgenfeld, because he regards the first epistle as genuine, naturally takes the second to be partly an imitation of the first and partly its antithesis, interpreting ii. 15, iii. 6 as an emphasizing of the oral and written apostolic tradition, such as could only belong to the second century. Notwithstanding the manifest weakness of these doubts already apparent in the uncertainty as to the relation to the first epistle, the rejection of the second epistle has become almost as universal in the modern critical school as the recognition of the first. P. Schmidt alone (Excursus to his *Thessalonicherbrief*, 1885) has distinctly admitted that, apart from the eschatological passage of chap. ii. and

isolated interpolations, there is nothing to prevent our regarding this epistle as a shorter Pauline written on the basis of later accounts.¹ Hence the whole question turns upon the idea whether the apocalyptic combination of chap. ii., which like all such, is attached to existing relations of time, brings us into the post-Pauline period, or may be explained from the circumstances of the time in which our epistle, if genuine, must have been written.

6. The proper leading motive even of Kern's attack lay in the presupposition that the apocalyptic view of our epistle was the same as that of the Apocalypse of John. Consistently with the current idea of the latter, Antichrist was identified with the Emperor Nero, of whom there was a tradition that he was not dead but should return from the East. The hindering one is then the Emperor Vespasian, with his son Titus; the apostasy, the horrible infamy that broke forth in the Jewish war. Hence this apocalyptic picture must have been drawn by a Pauline disciple living in the years 68-70 and struck with the image presented by his time. Upon this basis Baur thought it possible to fix the place of the epistle still more definitely. According to Tacit., *Hist.*, 2, 8, after the murder of Galba a report was actually spread in Achaia and Asia that the returning Nero was at hand. But this soon proved to be false, and the author, as a warning against similar delusions, pointed out

¹ The alleged unreconciled discrepancies with the eschatological discussions of the first epistle, which he still finds in chap. ii., disappear readily enough. For the fact that the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night (1 Thess. v. 2) by no means excludes the appearance of Antichrist immediately before, whose exaltation out of the great apostasy is just as incalculable as the former event; and just as little does the fact that the Apostle still hopes to live to see the second coming (1 Thess. iv. 17) exclude the putting aside of the idea that it was already at hand. The misleading of unbelievers by Antichrist (2 Thess. ii. 10, f.) certainly does not shut out the possibility of their living in rest and security until that time (1 Thess. v. 3), suspecting nothing of the destruction that the approaching judgment is to bring upon them.

that Vespasian must first be overthrown and the great apostasy come in, while the whole world idolized the returning Nero.¹ Hilgenfeld sought to give quite a different interpretation of the apocalyptic combination, making the ἀποστασία refer to the falling away in a time of severe persecution, and was thus led to the time of Trajan. But in face of all his attempts to prove traces of that time in the persecutions mentioned in our epistle, nothing except the word *διωγμοί* (comp. Rom. viii. 35; 2 Cor. xii. 10) points beyond the expression of the first epistle; and how the appearance of the Elxai-book should first have given rise to the enhanced expectation of the second coming is beyond conception. Above all he makes the *μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας* refer to germinating Gnosticism which, as an anti-Christian force, he joins with the returning Nero in a way that is quite impracticable; and that the Empire under Trajan, with its persecution of Christianity, should hinder the development of the anti-Christian power from reaching its highest stage, is a thought repugnant to common sense.² P. Schmidt has rightly declared against this application of the epistle to the time of Trajan; but while going

¹ But according to ii. 2 f. there was so little disposition to look for Antichrist in any historical personage, that people were deceived as to the nearness of the second advent the rather because they seemed quite to have forgotten that it must first be preceded by this climax of hostility to Christ. In the description of the *ἀνομος* who with his lying wonders deceived the world (ii. 8 f.), nothing points to the form of a world-ruler, especially as ii. 4 makes no mention whatever of his apotheosis but of his blasphemous self-exaltation. But it is still quite inconceivable how the appearing of the returning Nero is to result from an ἀποστασία or ἀνομία which is already active in secret (ii. 3, 6 f.); since neither the abominations of the Jewish war could bring about the return of Nero, nor the deification of Cæsar; nor can it be seen by what means Vespasian and Titus could check the development of the godless powers in their final personification.

² Hence Bahnsen has recently endeavoured to transpose the whole apocalyptic combination of this epistle into such position with respect to time that Antichrist is Gnosticism, and his *κατέχων* the episcopate (*Jahrb. für protest. Theol.*, 1880, 4).

back with Volkmar, Holtzmann, and others to the interpretation of Kern, he has not been able to justify it better than its author, or to carry it out exegetically. The presumed allusions of the epistle to the Apocalypse rest solely upon the eschatological expectations that were common to it with all primitive Christianity.

7. The historical interpretation of the epistle can only proceed from the fact which has been acknowledged since the Patristic period, and is maintained even amid the most contradictory conceptions, viz. that the thing which still checks the development of the anti-Christian power (τὸ κατέχον), is the continuance of the Roman jurisdiction, especially as the representative of it is called a person (ii. 7, ὁ κατέχων), which can only refer to the Roman Emperor.¹ We have here an apocalyptic combination belonging to an older time than that of John's Apocalypse, in which the Roman Empire itself appears as the upholder of anti-Christian power in consequence of the abominations of Nero. In accordance with this, the last incarnation of such power appears as a world-ruler, and beside it as the second beast, false prophecy, the power that leads men aside to worship it, while the man of lawlessness (the ἀνομος absolutely) is at the same time characterised as the false prophet by virtue of the signs and wonders given him by Satan. Since therefore the latter must be a product of the ἀποστασία, and this can neither be looked for in the sphere of Christianity in which our epistles recognise no opposites, nor in the sphere of heathenism which knows not God and does not honour Him (i. 8), the apostasy can only take place within Judaism, whose hostility against the

¹ It was indeed mere play of words that led Hitzig, Hausrath, Döllinger, Renan and others to think of the Emperor Claudius (*qui claudit*, comp. Märker, *Einige dunkle Umstände im Leben des Paulus*, Gütersloh, 1871), since a definite person does not here come into consideration, but only the upholder of the Roman empire as such.

Messiah and the gospel leads more and more to complete apostasy from God (comp. Heb. iii. 12). Antichrist, in whom this apostasy culminates, can only be the pseudo-Messiah, the lying image of the true Messiah.² This combination, which points directly to Matthew xxiv. 24, only making the multiplicity of *ψευδόχριστοι* and *ψευδοπροφήται* culminate in one person, is at once explained by the position taken by Paul in his first epistle, with respect to Judaism, as we have already seen. In Judaism, hostile to God and Christ, which at this time obstructed the Apostle on every side, checking him in his work (1 Thess. ii. 14-16, 18), the *ἀνομία* is already active though in secret (2 Thess. ii. 7). The thing which still kept back the full development of this anti-Christian power was the Roman jurisdiction, which alone protected the Apostle from the attacks of Jewish fanaticism, as he had hitherto experienced. Only in case the definitive apostasy of unbelieving Judaism culminated in the pseudo-Messiah who, equipped with Satanic powers, should overthrow the bulwark of the Roman administration in the last Jewish revolution, was the way opened up for anti-Christianity, to the complete destruction of Christianity; if the return of the true Messiah had not at this very juncture at once put an end to His caricature. Of the struggles by which this last catastrophe is brought about, as represented

² When on the other hand it is always objected that the self-apotheosis in ii. 4 is in contradiction to the conception of the pseudo-Messiah, the fact is entirely overlooked that this blasphemous self-exaltation was already advanced by the unbelieving Jews against Christ, as a mark of his pseudo-Messiahship. As Jehovah Himself comes to His people in His Messiah, the pseudo-Messiah can only be recognised from his making himself God; and since ii. 4 can only refer to the temple at Jerusalem, it must be the pseudo-Jewish Messiah who by his coming to it proclaims himself as the Jehovah who appeared among His people. That the apostasy appears as apostasy to *ἀνομία*, so far from excluding the manifestation of such apostasy in the sphere of Judaism, rather refers the severance from God and His law as the climax of all sin, to Judaism alone; while the alleged zeal for the law manifested by the Jews in their enmity against Christ and His gospel, may be taken as actual *ἀνομία*.

throughout John's Apocalypse, our epistle shows as little trace as of the hope of the establishment of an earthly kingdom of the Messiah, which is connected in the Apocalypse with the idea that the anti-Christian power concentrated in a world-ruler is overcome by the returning Messiah. The Lord Jesus consumes the *ἄνομος* with the breath of His mouth (ii. 8) and leads His own, whom according to Matt. xxiv. 31 He gathers about Him (ii. 1, comp. 1 Thess. iv. 15), immediately into the completed kingdom of God (2 Thess. i. 5), where they become partakers of the heavenly glory of Christ (ii. 14). Thus the eschatological view of our epistle is not only not an argument against its genuineness, but on the contrary is the only ground on which it can be explained.³

§ 18. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

1. After a short sojourn in Antioch (§ 15, 7) Paul set out for Galatia and Phrygia, in order to strengthen the Churches there (Acts xviii. 23), and in accordance with his promise

³ It is objected against this view that according to Rom. xi. 25 f. Paul hoped for the conversion of all Israel, and cannot therefore have conceived of Antichrist as proceeding from rebellious Judaism, or as a pseudo-Messiah. But it is overlooked that these apocalyptic combinations, by which the signs of the times were interpreted, were always conditioned by the historical constellation and must therefore change with it (comp. § 22, 7, note 2). For this very reason that of our epistle is a product as well as an evidence of the period in which the strain between the Apostle and unbelieving Judaism which was opposed to him as his sole enemy, had reached its highest point. When it had been subsequently shown that this Judaism was not able to destroy the work of Christ in the Gentile world, when much severer struggles were prepared by Judaism in Christendom itself, he could no longer see in unbelieving Judaism as such the specific anti-Christian power; and it is one of the characteristic traits of the epoch to which the Roman Epistle belongs, that he returned to the primitive apostolic hope of all Israel's conversion. With the above interpretation, to which Mangold and Schenkel also assent, comp. *Zur Lehre vom Antichrist*, elaborated by Ed. Böhmer after Schneckenburger (*Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1859, 3) and B. Weiss, *Apokalyptische Studien*. 2 (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1869, 1).

made at Jerusalem, to make a collection among them for the poor of that city (Gal. ii. 10; comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 1).¹ During this visit Paul already found matters in Galatia by no means to his mind. In the interval, Judaistic influences had undoubtedly been at work in the Churches of that place, endeavouring to persuade the Gentile Christians that it was necessary for them to be circumcised (Gal. vi. 12), under the pretext that they could only be equal members of the Church of the Messiah (iv. 17) and participate in the full Messianic salvation, if they were thus incorporated with the chosen people to whom the Messiah had come. Care had indeed been taken not to carry this out to its proper conclusion by subjecting them at once to the whole burden of the law; for in order to open their eyes to the full meaning of this step, Paul had already to make a solemn declaration that each one who allowed himself to be circumcised bound himself to fulfil the whole law (v. 3). He did not, however, enter into lengthened discussion, but without more ado pronounced an anathema on all who should preach unto them another gospel than his (i. 9), viz. on all who should make full salvation dependent on anything but faith (comp. iv. 16, 20). He manifestly took his departure hoping that he had attained his object and had strengthened the Galatians anew against Judaistic deception.

There is not the slightest indication that the Judaistic agitation was brought from Judæa or Jerusalem into the Church, as is generally sup-

¹ According to this, the gospel seems in the interval to have spread from the Pauline Churches to Phrygia where he himself had not yet preached (Acts xvi. 6; comp. § 15, 2); yet he may, even at this time, have passed through only the north-eastern part of Phrygia, separated from the south-western part by the chain of mountains running through the country, since, according to Col. ii. 1, he did not personally know the Churches of the latter part. The visit to the Galatian Churches is expressly presupposed in Gal. iv. 13, because Paul designates his stay in which he first preached the gospel there as an earlier one; while on the contrary, Acts xviii. 23 presupposes the existence of Christian Churches in Galatia and Phrygia, notwithstanding xvi. 6.

posed ; but within the Pauline Churches the Jewish element was certainly too unimportant to be able to advance such claims where the immense majority of the Churches was concerned. The fact that the question as to how the two different forms of Christianity, characterised respectively by freedom from the law and fidelity to the law, should be reconciled, here cropped up again, can only be explained from the circumstance that in Galatia Jewish Churches had formerly existed side by side with the Pauline Churches. It must remain uncertain how much was known in the Diaspora of the decrees at Jerusalem (§ 14, 4) and how far people considered themselves bound by them, since even in Judea the party of Pharisaic zealots did not consider themselves bound by these decrees, which from their standpoint could only seem to be unauthorized concessions, while afterwards as well as before they called upon believers to come out of heathenism into Judaism. It is certain that those who here made this requisition had only just gained an entrance into the Pauline Churches, for Paul constantly makes a distinction between them and the Church members whom he addresses (i. 7, iv. 17, v. 10, 12).³

2. The journey of the Apostle was directed to Ephesus (Acts xix. 1), in accordance with his former promise (xviii. 21). But he cannot have been there long when new accounts from Galatia brought him the sorrowful tidings that the hopes with which he had left the Churches of that place had been grievously disappointed. By the persuasive arts of men they had been led away from the truth (Gal. v. 7 f.), and had actually turned aside from the free Pauline gospel to

³ A. H. Franke (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1883, 1) refers the first error of the Church back to an eclectic Jewish Christianity inclining to theosophy in Asia Minor itself, which, however, cannot be proved (comp., on the other side, Hilgenfeld, in his *Zeitsch.*, 1884, and Mangold). That the Jews of the Diaspora did not from the first bind themselves so strictly to all legal prescriptions in their inevitable intercourse with the uncircumcised (Gal. vi. 13), and therefore did not impose them upon the Gentile Christians (v. 3), so far as this omission at first did not arise from policy, is conceivable enough ; so too is the fact that they first sought to introduce the Jewish order of festivals and worship (iv. 10), which, moreover, commended itself to the young Gentile Christians as a compensation for their heathen worship, such as the Pauline Church life did not afford. The former disputing of the fact that Paul, on his visit to Galatia, found the Churches already disturbed by Jewish-Christian agitation, attempted by Eichhorn, Neander, de Wette, and Bleek, may be regarded as given up.

the new doctrine of law (i. 6). The Jewish festivals had already been introduced (iv. 9 f.); and although there is no indication that the last decisive step had been taken (v. 2), yet they were evidently not far from adopting circumcision. A portion of the Church seems indeed to have held fast by Christian freedom; but by their arrogant and rough behaviour towards the erring brethren appear to have only increased the confusion (v. 15, 26-vi. 3). The Apostle was dismayed, the Church seemed bewitched as by magic (i. 6, iii. 1), and in fact the question arose, what produced this sudden change? But here too the Epistle contains no hint that they were emissaries from Jerusalem who had bewitched the Church by the authority of some great name.¹ The explanation lies simply in the fact that the question which had formerly been treated by the Jewish Christians of Galatia as an obvious consequence of the faith in the Messiah of Israel that was adopted by the Gentile Christians, had by the energetic interposition of Paul first become a party question, in which the authority of the primitive apostles was set up against that of Paul. It is indeed entirely arbitrary to assume that all the matters discussed by Paul in Gal. i. and ii. had been presented to the Galatians in a false light; since Paul makes no attempt to remove an incorrect understanding of them. But it was very

¹ Franke is willing to concede this to the common view; but if the change had been brought about by so definite a fact, Paul would in any case have indicated this cause, which explained it only too easily. It is obviously the same *τινές* who at that time led the Church astray, and against whom he had already hurled the anathema on his first visit (i. 6, 9), who now sought to gain them over, and with whom he had already contended for them at that time (iv. 17 f.). How could Paul say *τίς ὑμῶν ἐβλάσφημεν* (iii. 1) if they were real intruders who had done so; and the view that v. 10 alludes to some great unnamed in whose authority the seducers acted, is purely imaginative. The *ταχέως* in i. 6 does not permit the idea that the Jerusalemites were called in to help; they must have come quite accidentally at a moment when they were able to throw the Church that had been brought to reason by Paul, into still worse error.

natural that the Judaists should appeal to the primitive apostles who remained faithful to the law and laboured for the conversion of Israel, in favour of the fact that the Messiah first came to bring the promised salvation to the chosen people, from which it seemed to follow as a matter of course that all who, like them, wished to participate in the fulfilment of salvation must, like them, be Jews faithful to the law. Though Paul, on the other hand, appealed to his gospel that offered the free grace of God to the Gentiles without subjecting them to the law or to circumcision, yet it seemed as if he who had been later converted and later called to be an apostle, could only have received the gospel and the commission to preach it from them (i. 1, 11 f.), and that his gospel was rather a perversion of the primitive apostolic gospel of Christ which recognised no abrogation of the old law of God, and not that gospel itself (i. 7). At the most, one view was opposed to another; and what actual ground had the Galatians for being led away by Paul's rugged bearing and passionate zeal for his gospel from the course on which they had so willingly entered, and by which they wished first to secure for themselves the full promises of the gospel? It is manifest that a very unfavourable construction had been put on this mode of his appearing; and the momentary impression it must have produced might readily have been transformed by memory into an opposite feeling (iv. 16, 20). Moreover, they felt that they could appeal to the fact that even Paul himself was not on principle opposed to circumcision, which in certain cases he required² and that it was a desire to please that led him not to exact it, in order to make it easier for

² It has indeed been thought inconceivable how such an assertion could arise; but it was certainly known in Galatia that Paul himself caused Timothy to be circumcised (§ 15, 1, note 2), and undoubtedly he did not, according to 1 Cor. vii. 18, require Jewish parents to omit the circumcision of their children, as his conduct in opposition to the reproach (Acts xxi. 21) unquestionably shows.

them to receive the gospel (i. 10, v. 11). Thus the whole question suddenly appeared in quite a new light, which was blinding enough to confuse the Galatians and bring them to submission.³

3. The great historical importance of this epistle, which Paul wrote in consequence of tidings that had reached him from Galatia, consists in the fact that in it he found it necessary for the first time to come to a full understanding with Judaistic error. The primitive apostles had formerly recognised his free gospel, because they saw a Divine intimation to this effect in the Gentile conversions (§ 14, 4). But it was now attacked in its vital principle.¹ It must not indeed

³ This is only incomprehensible if we suppose that Paul from the first preached a gospel to the Galatians in which the abrogation of the law through the cross of Christ was set forth with fundamental clearness. On the contrary, his preaching of the gospel in Galatia undoubtedly touched the question of the law as little as it had done in Thessalonica. He had announced Jesus to them as the Saviour in the final judgment, without need of coming to a compromise with the law of Israel, which was quite foreign to the uncircumcised. He had even on his second visit there simply put aside the question of circumcision and the law, because his announcement of salvation had nothing to do with it, and faith could only be destroyed by it. Now, however, it met him and demanded a thorough explanation.

¹ It was not indeed a few depraved fanatics who rose against his authority, least of all former proselytes, as Neander, de Wette, Bleek and others assume, from a misinterpretation of v. 12, vi. 13. We must not be misled by the excited polemic of the Apostle, which, after the question had once culminated in an attack on his official authority and personal integrity, did not remain free from some passionate irritation (comp. v. 12). It was certainly not without foundation that he reproached the deceivers of the Church with having, consciously or unconsciously, no deeper motive in the zeal with which they sought to make proselytes to Judaism among the believing Gentiles than to commend themselves to their unbelieving countrymen, in order that by this means their own faith in a crucified Messiah might be excused (vi. 12 f.). But it by no means follows from this that they were not fully persuaded in their zeal for God's law and the promises given to the people of the circumcision, and thought in this way to promote the true salvation of believers from among the Gentiles, regarding both as compatible with, and even necessary to faith in the Messiah and the salvation brought by Him as well as that which was still expected.

be supposed that the Galatian Jewish Christians set up a formal doctrine of salvation based on fundamental principles in opposition to his, putting the doctrine of justification by works over against that of justification by faith, and the view of Christianity as a Jewish doctrine over against his view of it as a universal religion (comp. § 14, 3, note 2). This it is that forms the epoch-making importance of the Galatian Epistle, viz. that in it Paul first became aware of the full range and great danger of Judaistic error as regarded the principle of the doctrine of salvation, and exposed it with dialectic acuteness. However specious the reasons for requiring circumcision and the fulfilment of the law, and however compatible it might be made to appear with faith in the Messiah, as a matter of fact it could only tend to draw away from the sole ground of salvation all who yielded to it; for if anything else were recognised as necessary to salvation, Christ was not in reality the exclusive and all-sufficient source of salvation, nor the grace of God manifested in Him the only ground of salvation, invalidating all human work and human merit. On the other hand, the heathen Churches could not be secured against the fresh claims constantly made on them, unless the Divine origin of his gospel in the free grace of God in Christ were clearly set forth, proof being given that it was in no respect at variance with the law and the promise of the Old Testament revelation of God, but rather that both tended to the same goal of faith as the sole condition of salvation. Finally it was necessary to show how the fundamental freedom from the law necessarily required by his gospel, if the principles on which it was based were not continually to be called in question, did not by any means give a licence to sin, but rather worked out the fulfilment of the will of God revealed in the law, on the basis of his gospel, though only in a new way. How the individual processes of thought which led to this end gradually opened up to the Apostle is naturally be-

yond proof. We only know as a matter of history that his peculiar doctrine of salvation first emerged with the clearness of a principle and with full certainty, in the Epistle to the Galatians, and that it was in the struggle with Judaism that he forged from it his sharpest weapons.²

4. Even in the introductory greeting Paul emphatically describes himself as one who had received his apostolic calling not from man, nor yet by human mediation, but from Christ, who, as having been raised from the dead by the Father, could only have mediated such calling as the instrument of God Himself; and, as the only ground of salvation, points to the death of Christ, by whom according to the Divine will they are delivered from this present evil world, and therefore need no longer fear the destruction by

² The presupposition which here lies at the basis, viz. that the Galatian Epistle was written soon after the arrival of the Apostle at Ephesus, may now be looked upon as settled. Formerly opinions respecting the time of its composition were very unsettled. When it was thought that the Churches were already founded in the first missionary journey (§ 13, 4, note 3), and therefore the second visit to Galatia was seen in Acts xvi. 1, the epistle must have been written before the Macedonian mission, and was consequently the earliest of all, as is still the opinion of Hausrath (comp. also Schenkel). And when Gal. ii. was made to refer to his visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Acts xi. 30 (§ 14, 3), the epistle could even be carried up, as Keil, Paulus, Böttger, and others do, prior to the apostolic council. An earlier date was naturally come to by all who, with Grotius, denied the second visit of the Apostle to Galatia. On the contrary, others, as Mill, have put it, on account of ii. 10, into the last visit to Jerusalem; or, like Schrader and Köhler, have even dated it from Rome, according to the subscription of the Received Text, which originated in a misunderstanding of vi. 17. But all these hypotheses fall to pieces of themselves with their false assumptions. Hug and Rückert also put the epistle too early when they represent it as written on the journey to Ephesus, since in that case the time is too short for the revolution that had occurred in the meantime. On the other hand, Credner, de Wette, and Bleek make it too late, supposing it to have been written after the stay at Ephesus, somewhere in the interval between 2 Cor. and Rom., on account of the resemblance between it and the latter epistle, with which the *ὄντως ταχέως*, i. 6, is quite irreconcilable. The assumption of Hofmann that it was called forth by a writing of the Galatians to the Apostle is destitute of all foundation.

which it is threatened (i. 1-5).¹ But instead of beginning with a thanksgiving for the praiseworthy state of the Church, as he does elsewhere, he at once gives expression to his surprise at so inconceivably rapid an apostasy to another gospel against the preacher of which he repeats his anathema, as against those who pervert the *one* gospel of Christ preached by him (i. 6-9); from which uncompromising firmness they might see that he did not speak only to please men (i. 10). He justifies his right to speak thus, by affirming that the gospel he preached was not received from man, but was revealed to him by Christ (i. 11 f.). He shows for example that prior to his conversion he was by no means disposed to take any notice of the gospel (comp. § 13, 2), except such as might be expected from the hatred that animated the persecutor of the Christians. Moreover when it pleased God to reveal His Son to him, he did not by any means seek out the primitive apostles in order to hear more about the matter from them, but only made the acquaintance of Peter, and James the brother of the Lord, three years afterwards, on the occasion of a fourteen days' visit to Jerusalem (comp. § 13, 3). From that place he went immediately to Syria and Cilicia, without making himself known even by face to the Churches of Judca, in which the other apostles presumably worked. When, notwithstanding, these Churches heard that he preached the same faith that he had formerly attacked, and thanked God on his account, this proved that

¹ Though persistently misunderstood, it is yet an undoubted fact that this is the only passage that can be interpreted as a defence of his apostleship; and even it is directed not against those who attacked the apostleship in itself, but against the assumption that it was conferred on him by the primitive apostles. Here, too, as always in his Gentile-apostolic preaching, the Apostle sets out with the deliverance of believers from the destruction that threatened them together with the whole world (§ 15, 4, note 1; 5, note 2), only he lays such stress on its having been mediated by the death of Christ, in opposition to those who sought to persuade the Galatians that some additional help was required on their part.

his gospel was from the beginning no other than that of the primitive apostles, and that he had not received it from them, but by direct revelation (i. 13-24). It was not until fourteen years after the beginning of his independent ministry that he found it necessary to lay his gospel, as he had preached it among the Gentiles (§ 14, 3, note 2), before the primitive Church and its authorities; and although he had been obliged to refuse to circumcise even Titus, because of false brethren who wished to subject his Gentile Christians to the yoke of the law (comp. § 14, 4, note 1), his gospel was then recognised as quite sufficient for salvation, and the Gentile mission, for which the authorities at Jerusalem had admitted his specific qualification and calling, was solemnly entrusted to him (ii. 1-10).² He then goes on to tell of the occurrence at Antioch, from which it appears how he had maintained this gospel even against Peter, when the latter, from fear of the more rigid Jewish Christians virtually denied the recognition of it which he formerly expressed (ii. 11-14, 17 f.). But when he gives a more detailed account of the ideas to which he then gave utterance in opposition to Peter, he does so with express reference to the importance he now attached to the legal question as a principle. He shows how the recognition of the inability of man to become righteous by the works of the law, *à priori* involved in faith in the Messiah, must necessarily lead to the seeking of justification by faith *alone* and not by works at all (ii. 15 f.), since the

² Just as certainly as Gal. ii. 7 f. shows that the recognition of an apostolic position equal to that of Paul was not refused to him (comp. § 14, 5, note 1), so certainly is it not his apostolic dignity that Paul here defends, but the recognition of the gospel he had preached to the Gentiles on the part of the primitive apostles, which he proves, because he on his part had been accused of perverting the gospel received from the primitive apostles by preaching freedom from the law. Nor can there be any doubt that his readers learn through him for the first time what he here tells of his relations to the primitive apostles, so that this point cannot at all have come again under discussion on the occasion of his second visit to Galatia.

new life to which the believer attains in fellowship with Christ, presupposes that his old life, under the law, suffered death (ii. 19 f.), and since the grace of God in which we are made partakers by the death of Christ would lose its specific significance if righteousness could by any means be obtained through the law (ii. 21). He thus lifts the question of circumcision and the law, which is in the first place purely practical, to the level of a doctrinal speculation from which its incompatibility with the fundamental premisses of the doctrine of salvation is made clear (comp. § 14, 6).

5. With a renewed expression of surprise that they should have been bewitched, the Apostle refers the Galatians to their own experience of salvation, since they themselves knew that they attained the highest gift of their present state by salvation, viz. the Spirit with its manifestations of power, not by virtue of the works of the law but by virtue of their faith (iii. 1-5). Hence it is clear that only in the same way can they attain to the highest and final fulness of salvation.¹ He therefore shows how the promise that in Abraham *all* nations should be blessed implies that it is not the sons of Abraham after the flesh, as such, who are to be blessed, in conjunction with him the faithful one, but those resembling him in character, who like him are justified by faith (iii. 6-9). Moreover the law, which demands works, owing to the manifest impossibility of its perfect fulfilment brought a curse only on the children of Abraham after the flesh, who were under obligation to carry it out, Christ himself being made a curse on the cross, in order to remit this curse, that in him as the sole mediator of salvation, the

¹ In the discussion that follows, the question is not of justification; for it was Paul who first applied the legal question in a doctrinal form to the question as to the ground of justification, while the requirement of the Judaists was based on the assumption that the fulness of salvation promised to Abraham and his seed could only be attained through incorporation, by means of circumcision and the acceptance of the law, with the race that sprang from him.

blessing of Abraham (fulness of salvation) might come on the Gentiles who had already received the gift of the Spirit by faith in Him (iii. 10-14). The law that was given so much later has neither power nor will to alter the fact that fulness of salvation is granted by God as a free gift of grace by means of the promise (iii. 15-19); its aim is rather, by always urging to new transgressions and thus riveting the chains of slavery to sin, to make it impossible to strive for the fulfilment of the promise by individual fulfilment of the law, and thus itself to lead to Christ in order to the reception of justification by faith (iii. 20-24). And by faith we become sons of God, who, because incorporated into Christ by baptism, whether Jews or Gentiles, belong with him to the seed of Abraham to whom the inheritance was promised (iii. 25-39). The heir during the time of his minority may be placed under tutelage, which always brings him into slavish dependence; but even the children of Abraham, who are under the law, are entirely set free from its tutelage, by the sending of the Son of God, and His subjection to the law, and are made full sons of God, while all who are in truth children of God, are certified of this by the Spirit sent to them, in order to assure them of the heavenly inheritance (iv. 1-7).² The adoption of the legal worship is therefore simply a relapse into a state of bondage, such as that to which they had been subject during their religious minority in heathenism (iv. 8-11). He urges that, as a thank-offering towards him, who from love to the heathen had become an *ἄνομος*, they should henceforth, like him, free themselves

² The discussion which constantly goes back to the point from which it started (iii. 14; iv. 6, comp. iii. 2, 5) and is thus shut up within itself, endeavours to prove from a correct interpretation of the promise given in the Old Testament and its relation to the law, that the attainment of the fulness of salvation is and remains independent of the law, to which likewise the heathen were necessarily bound so soon as they turned to the God of Israel by whom it had been given, if given at all, in order by means of it to attain righteousness and salvation, and therefore the discussion concludes with an application to the readers.

from all servile bondage to the law; and in touching words recalls the grateful love they had shown him at his first visit when he preached the gospel to them (iv. 12-15). Had he become their enemy, because during his second stay with them he had told them the truth with earnestness? He had only been zealous for them, and still continued so, because others courted them in order to gain them over for themselves; he travailed again in birth for them, that in them as his true children Christ might be formed. If his severity had wounded them, he would change his voice, that he might gain by tones of tenderest love what his severity had been unable to effect (iv. 16-20).

6. After this outpouring of the heart¹ the Apostle collects his thoughts once more, in order to throw fresh light on the main theme of his epistle under a new aspect. Since the Judaists had naturally appealed to the Scriptures, he too, as in his first argument (iii. 6, 8), makes the Scriptures his starting-point, and by an allegorical interpretation of the narrative of the two sons of Abraham, proves that they are the sons of the freewoman and therefore children of the promise and heirs after the manner of Isaac (iv. 21-31). He then exhorts them to remain in a state of freedom, and not by adopting circumcision to take on again the yoke of the law, since all the righteousness they could gain from the law only separated them from the grace of God in Christ, in whom circumcision was of no avail but only faith (v. 1-6). But he has confidence in them, that they will recognise of themselves that it was only the persuasion of men that had led them away from the truth, and leaves those who have troubled them to the judgment of God. Remembering however that these latter did not scruple to avail themselves of misrepresentation, stating that he himself had sometimes

¹ Whether this outpouring (iv. 12-20) be counted as belonging to the preceding division, or with Holsten and others as the introduction to what follows, is essentially a matter of indifference.

preached circumcision, he utters the hard sarcastic saying, that he might as well summon these disturbers who attached such value to circumcision as the beginning of self-mutilation, to make eunuchs of themselves (v. 7-12). But the reason why he looks at the question in this latter part of the epistle under the aspect of Christian freedom, in which he would fain have them remain, becomes quite clear only in what follows. For he finds it necessary to begin by stating that this freedom excludes all yielding to the flesh, and includes mutual service in love which is the fulfilment of the whole law. But it is plain that in this respect even the free-minded had failed (v. 13-15). He therefore points out to them that the true freedom of the law consists in walking according to the Spirit, which continually prevents the flesh from reasserting itself; for the Spirit only excludes the works of the flesh, of which he has told them before that they are incompatible with the blessed aim of Christianity, while it begets works such as no law can condemn; but all true Christians must have crucified the flesh and must walk in accordance with the Spirit (v. 16-25). With unmistakable reference to the moral deficiencies that the dispute on the legal question had disclosed even in those who had remained steadfast (v. 26, comp. v. 15), he goes on to show how love that gently corrects the erring neighbour, bearing his weaknesses in the consciousness of one's own fallibility, alone fulfils the law of Christ, so that it is necessary that every man should humbly prove himself, and be concerned for his own salvation, taking care to communicate unto him that teacheth, in all good things (vi. 1-6). The Apostle then concludes with the serious admonition to sow to the Spirit and not to the flesh, never to weary in moral effort, and to do good, especially in intercourse with those who are companions in faith (vi. 7-10). The postscript in his own hand follows, in which he confronts the seducers who seek for their own glory to win the Galatians over to be circum-

cised, comparing them with himself who gloried only in the cross of Christ to whom circumcision availed as little as uncircumcision in opposition to a new creature, including in his benediction true, *i.e.* believing Israel, as well as all (uncircumcised) who walk according to this rule. Referring to the marks of his sufferings which he bears in his body as a servant of Christ, he concludes with the touching request not to give him further trouble, adding a short benediction, without any greeting to themselves or others (vi. 11 f.).²

7. *Ephesus*, the famous ancient capital of Ionia, situated on the Cayster, became the metropolis of the province of Asia after the kingdom of Pergamos was transferred to the Romans (B.C. 133). The city was splendid and extensive; it carried on an active trade and possessed a great theatre. The old temple of Diana, situated in the vicinity, which was burnt down on the night that Alexander the Great was born, had since been rebuilt with greater magnificence, and was counted among the wonders of the old world. The image of the great Diana of Ephesus, preserved there from a very early period, was reputed to have fallen from heaven. Small copies of the temple, the manufacture of which in silver formed an active branch of trade in Ephesus, were sold in great numbers, being set up in the houses and also carried as amulets on journeys. Paul had already begun to work among the Jews of the place on his first journey (§ 15, 7),

² His request was undoubtedly fulfilled; we have no historical indication that he ever again found it necessary to warn his Galatian Churches against relapsing into Jewish legality. This is certainly unintelligible if we suppose that he had from the beginning preached mainly justification by faith and true Christian freedom, arguing it out as represented in this epistle; but can be understood, if this epistle were the bold stroke in which for the first time, with lucid clearness, forcible dialectic and lively warmth, he explained the incompatibility of the Judaistic requirement with the final premisses of his doctrine of grace and salvation, the compatibility of the latter with the Old Testament revelation of salvation rightly understood, and the identity of true Christian freedom and obligation to the law of the new spiritual life.

and Aquila, who had settled there with his wife Priscilla, continued his work. They were joined by an Alexandrian Jew named Apollos, whom the Acts extol on account of his eloquence and knowledge of the Scriptures (xviii. 24). He belonged to a circle of men to whom the designation Johannine disciples is commonly given but erroneously, since their peculiarity consisted only in the fact that with them the Johannine baptism in practice and a specific Christian baptism by which the Holy Ghost was received, were unknown.¹ But Aquila and Priscilla initiated him more deeply into the customs of the Church, and in every way encouraged him in his resolve to go to Achaia, where he at once began a vigorous work, partly in the Corinthian Churches and partly among his fellow-countrymen (xviii. 25-28). Paul seems to have arrived at Ephesus soon afterwards (xix. 1; comp. No. 2). The common view that this was the beginning of a third missionary journey on his part is quite erroneous. It is quite plain that in leaving Antioch on this occasion (xviii. 23) Paul by no means undertook a new missionary journey, but changed his residence permanently from Antioch to

¹ Of Apollos we are told that he *ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ζέων τῷ πνεύματι ἐλάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*; and since he did this with great frankness in the synagogue (xviii. 25 f.), there can be no doubt that he already proclaimed Jesus as the Messiah, and therefore did not, like the Baptist and his disciples, still look for a Messiah (in the Jewish national sense). So too the men to whose circle he undoubtedly belonged (comp. xviii. 25 with xix. 3) are termed *μαθηταί*; but they know nothing yet of the Holy Ghost (xix. 1 f.). Paul, however, informs them that the baptism of repentance was only designed for those who should first believe in Him who followed the Baptist, and therefore could not suffice for those who already believed in the name of Jesus (xix. 4). This phenomenon, no longer fully apprehended by the author of the Acts, was a remarkable one, inasmuch as it shows traces of a Christianity that had taken form without connection with the primitive apostles or the primitive Church. Of a subsequent baptism of Apollos we find no mention, for the gifts of the Spirit were already visible in his inspired activity for Jesus, while his companions were certainly re-baptized by Paul, that by their own experience they might be led to understand the nature of Christian baptism (xix. 5 ff.).

Ephesus, where, in the centre of the Church-circle that he had founded, he was equally near to the Galatian and Macedonian-Greek Churches. There he could again carry on his trade in conjunction with Aquila, supporting himself by his own work (xx. 33 f.); and owing to the busy commerce of the city, his ministry in that place would be important for the whole province of Asia (xix. 10), without the necessity of his making a missionary journey through it.

It is only in connection with this account of Apollos that the Acts go on to speak of the way in which Paul first led his like-minded associates to an understanding of specific Christian baptism (xix. 1-7). What is of far greater importance is the fact that Paul made every effort in order to prepare a permanent place for the gospel among the Jews who were settled there, and by no means without success. But after three months he found it necessary, on account of their hostility, to separate the Church entirely from the synagogue, and to select the auditorium of Tyrannus a Greek rhetorician, as the place of his regular preaching, and that was certainly the beginning of an influential Gentile-apostolic ministry of far-reaching success (xix. 8-10), of which unfortunately the Acts have only preserved some fragmentary outlines (xix. 11-20). But Paul himself boasts of its having been visibly blessed, though he does not conceal the fact that it roused many adversaries against him (1 Cor. xvi. 9). It is certain that the latter are not to be found solely among the unbelieving Jews (Acts xx. 19), who were able here, as elsewhere, to stir up the heathen population against him. His life there seems to him like a constant combat with wild beasts (1 Cor. xv. 32), and once at least he must have been directly threatened with death, from which only the devotion of his hosts, at the risk of their own lives, saved him (Rom. xvi. 4).

The Acts compute his activity subsequent to the breach with the synagogue, at two years (xix. 20); but with the three preceding months (xix. 8) and the time he still remained after the sending away of Timothy (xix. 22), he must have spent three almost uninterrupted years in that place (xx. 31).² To the first of these years the Galatian Epistle belongs.

² The chronological estimate of these 2-3 years is, of course, still more uncertain than that of the years spent in Corinth (§ 15, 6), since we have no point of attachment, and do not even know how long he stayed on at Antioch in the interval. According to the usual computation, the result arrived at is from the years 55-57 or perhaps 56-58.

§ 19. THE CORINTHIAN DISORDERS.

1. To the time of the Apostle's stay at Ephesus belong the heavy cares prepared for him by the development of the Corinthian Church. Apollos indeed arrived there not long after him and worked in the spirit of the Apostle being blessed in his ministry (1 Cor. iii. 6). The fact that towards the end of his activity at Ephesus the Apostle frequently besought him to return to Corinth, shows that after his former efficiency Paul expected only good to result (xvi. 12). But Church-life at Corinth had suffered much injury from the first. It must have been on the occasion of a trip that Paul made from Ephesus, of whose object we have no knowledge, that he visited Corinth in passing (xvi. 7); but even at that time he had no pleasure in the Church. He complains that he had been humbled (by the circumstances in which he found the Church), and had been obliged to make them sorry (2 Cor. xii. 21, ii. 1). It is true that, remembering possibly how little his severity had availed in Galatia, he had at that time gone to them in gentleness, and had hesitated to take vigorous measures (x. 1, 10); but even then it had been necessary to threaten them with relentless punishment if the evil were not put away (xiii. 2).¹ It is not improbable that even at this visit it was

¹ This visit of Paul to Corinth has, it is true, been contested by Lange, Baur (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, 2), Fr. Märker (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1872, 1) and recently again by Heinrici (in Meyer's *Kommentar*, 1881, 83), and Hilgenfeld; but 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1 f., so directly imply such a visit, that ingenuity alone can explain it away. It is certainly strange that, apart from 1 Cor. xvi. 7, where it must be conceded that a reference to the second visit does not necessarily occur, the first epistle makes no allusion to it, neither in iv. 21, where Paul likewise threatens to come to them with severity, nor in chap. v., where he speaks of those very sins of unchastity which were certainly his main ground of dissatisfaction even at that time. For this reason, Ewald, O. Eylau (*zur Chronologie der Corintherbriege*, Landsberg a. d. W., 1873), Weizsäcker (*Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1873, 4; 1876, 4), and Mangold, have tried to put this visit between the first and second Epistle, which, according to all the statements of the latter,

necessary for Paul to denounce sins of unchastity above all (comp. 2 Cor. xii. 21, xiii. 2); for the first epistle, which Paul probably wrote to the Church soon after his return, and which has unfortunately been lost to us, evidently referred to this form of sin (comp. § 16, 2). In it, as on a similar occasion in the second Epistle to the Thessalonians, he gave direction that all intercourse should be broken off with the unrepentant sinners in the Church. But they either did not or would not understand him; and under the pretext that Paul wished to prohibit all intercourse with Gentile sinners, they consoled themselves with the impracticability of such separation (1 Cor. v. 9 ff.).²

2. The main reason why Church-life at Corinth could not attain to healthy development manifestly lay in the fact that the young Gentile Christians neither could nor would give up close social intercourse with their unbelieving countrymen. Afterwards, as before, they received invitations from them to feasts (1 Cor. x. 27), and did not even scruple to take part in the sacrificial feasts of the heathen (x. 21 f.), where they were certain to meet with renewed temptation to wantonness and lust. How little they regarded themselves as absolved from their former relations, is clearly shown by

enabling us to follow the Apostle step by step, is quite impossible. But it may be presumed that the first Epistle to the Corinthians, which has been lost to us, was connected with this visit; and that the sole reason of its being mentioned in our second epistle is that in it Paul made immediate preparation for a new visit. There is no ground for regarding this visit, with Anger and others, only as the return from a longer trip during the one and a half year's stay at Corinth, or for putting it, with Neander, into the stay at Antioch (Acts xviii. 22).

² According to this, the substance of 2 Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1, in which section A. H. Franke (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1884, 4), after the example of Hilgenfeld, endeavours to find a remnant of this epistle, would certainly approximately correspond to what the latter must have contained. But there is no cogent reason for regarding this section as an interpolation, nor is there any probability in favour of the supposition that a portion of that epistle should have got into our second one at all, much less into that particular passage of it.

the circumstance that they did not hesitate to take their private transactions with Christian brethren before heathen tribunals and there to carry on their lawsuits. Owing to this close intercourse with their heathen fellow-countrymen, the views of morality prevalent with the latter and the universal corruption of morals in which they were involved could not fail to exercise a contaminating influence on the Church. Hence it was that sins of unchastity gave the Apostle far more trouble here than in Thessalonica. The predominant (Gentile-Christian) part of the Church had moreover carried with them out of the past the idea that sexual intercourse outside marriage was just as much the satisfaction of a natural desire as the appeasing of hunger by food (vi. 12 f.), which has nothing whatever to do with morality. It had not been the intention of the Apostle simply to forbid unchastity by the Divine command, since this would have led back to the legal standpoint; but he had left it to the Holy Spirit to give the Christians the true guiding principle for their conduct in this respect, and had hoped that a purer moral feeling would thus result of itself. Nor was a strong moral reaction by any means wanting in the Church; this, however, did not yet lead to a more complete victory over the deeply-rooted propensity to sins of the flesh, but only to an external asceticism which threw doubt on all sexual intercourse even in marriage (vii. 3, 5), particularly in the case of a husband or wife who had remained heathen (vii. 12 ff.), and discussed such questions as whether a man might marry his daughter (vii. 36 ff.), or whether second marriage at all was permissible (vii. 39). In the same way opposition to those who at the sacrificial feasts of the heathen defiled themselves with idolatrous abominations, led to a scrupulous anxiety according to which all eating of flesh offered to idols was regarded as defiling and therefore against conscience (viii. 7), even what was bought in the market being so regarded (x. 20). It by no means appears

that this reaction took place only in Jewish-Christian circles and rested on legal motives; it was among Gentile Christians themselves that the most complete breach with the past could in this way be hoped for. But for that very reason the reaction had no influence on the majority of the Church; views were mutually opposed, and an actual moral reorganization of Christian life was not arrived at. Only in this way can it be explained that the Church was powerless even to develop the moral energy to rid itself of the most flagrant sinners (comp. No. 1). A case occurred where a man had married his own step-mother, who had either been left by her husband or had run away from him, and apparently while his father was still alive (1 Cor. v. 1; comp. 2 Cor. vii. 12), and was therefore living in open incest. But intercourse with the heathen was not without influence even on the life of faith. We have already seen how offensive the Christian doctrine of the resurrection continued to be to them (Acts xvii. 32; comp. § 17, 2); the Christians were frequently ridiculed on account of this doctrine, and had often enough been obliged to listen to the current arguments against it, being at length not indisposed to give it up (1 Cor. xv. 12), especially as in point of fact it seemed impossible for them to form an idea of it that was not open to contradiction (xv. 35).¹

3. The dark side of the Corinthian Church-life, like the bright side, undoubtedly had its roots in the specific Hellenic character of the Church in that place. The fact that such

¹ It is neither conceivable that Sadducean influences made themselves felt in the predominantly Gentile-Christian Church, nor that it was the influence of the philosophical culture of Corinth that gave rise to doubts regarding the resurrection, since the majority of the Church did not belong to the cultivated classes (1 Cor. i. 26 f), and that Paul intimates nothing as to the motives of these doubts that goes beyond the most superficial objections of common sense. The idea of a spiritualizing error, originating in Christian soil (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 18) is entirely alien to the circumstances of the young Christian Church.

an abundant fulness of gifts of grace was poured out on this Church, was in keeping with their spiritual activity and lively susceptibility (1 Cor. i. 5 f.). Here unquestionably lay their danger; for these gifts gave rise to inordinate vanity and ambition, the passion so characteristic of the Hellenic nature. Contention arose as to the respective value of this or that spiritual gift, especially as to whether the ecstatic speaking with tongues was to be preferred to the gift of prophecy; those who were supposed to be more highly endowed were envied, while the less remarkable gifts were despised. One did not allow another to speak, all spoke together, so that the abundance of gifts only tended to the confusion of the Church-meeting, instead of promoting its edification (comp. chap. xiv.). Even the women who as a matter of course felt their natural gifts stimulated and enhanced by the Spirit of God, were drawn into this procedure; they too wanted to speak and to assert themselves in the Church, if only under the pretext of asking questions and thus publicly proving their interest in religion (xiv. 34 f.). For this purpose it was necessary, that in opposition to the chaste custom of antiquity, they should lay aside the veils that covered them in assemblies of men (xi. 5, 10), and that again only supplied new food for vanity. But this worldliness that was thrusting itself into religious meetings was most objectionable when the love-feasts were concerned. Here ample occasion was given for the formation of coteries, destroying thereby the unity of the life of the Church (xi. 18 f.). The more largely the great majority of the Church was composed of the lower classes, the more natural it was that the more cultivated and well-to-do should sever themselves from it. Moreover the latter wished themselves to enjoy the richer provision they had brought to the feast; and while some ate and drank immoderately, others were hungry. By this means the religious, as well as the social character of the love-feasts, was destroyed (xi. 21 f.), and

Paul takes the matter so much in earnest as to see Divine punishment for this profanation of the sacred meal, in numerous cases of sickness and death that occurred just at that time (xi. 30). The question naturally arises, why did not the Church-rulers take measures long before against these profligate doings? Yet we find no indication of such a thing having been attempted. Nor are they anywhere held responsible for the reform of these abuses. From this it is clear beyond doubt that the Church at Corinth had no Church-rulers who were responsible for the guidance of meetings and the practice of chastity. Paul had evidently thought it better to allow the democratic bias of the Hellenic spirit full scope in the development of Church-life, in order that it might be entirely in sympathy with him. It is certain therefore that the Church as a body had autonomous control over its own affairs even the practice of chastity (v. 4); but there were some who by voluntary services done to the Church had gained the honourable privilege of having these recognised and at the same time the right to claim obedience in certain given cases (xvi. 15-18). Fruitful as this may have been in stirring up and strengthening the spirit of the Church, it was the more hazardous when the contending elements increased in violence (No. 2) and the disorders prevalent in meetings shattered the life of the Church.

We have no knowledge whatever of the fundamental principles which Paul followed in the external organization of his Churches. There is no reason to doubt that he organized those that he planted on the first missionary journey with Barnabas after the model of the synagogue (Acts xiv. 23), nor that the Ephesian Church had its own presbytery after the Church had been separated from the synagogue (xix. 9, xx. 17). But it is evident that the Macedonian Churches had already a different kind of organization in the rulers at Thessalonica (1 Thess. v. 12; comp. § 15, 4), the bishops and deacons at Philippi (Phil. i. 1), although we are without more specific knowledge of their privileges and duties. We neither know when this organization was introduced, nor whether Paul had a direct share in it. We learn as little of

Church-rulers from the Epistle to the Galatians as from the Corinthian Epistles. That the *οἰκία Στεφανῶ* (xvi. 15) did not consist of chosen officials of the Church endowed with express privileges and a definite circle of duties, follows indisputably not only from the nature of the case but also from the *εἰς διακονίαν ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς*. Nor has Paul any knowledge of exclusive holders of the gifts of *κυβερνήσεις* and *ἀντιλήψεις* (xii. 28), distinguished by an official title, which is not however inconsistent with the fact that the Church-meeting charged certain individuals who were thus endowed, with the care, under its guidance and control, of certain necessary functions. How far in so doing the traditional forms of religious association, that must have supplied the frame for the political existence of the Christian Church were adhered to, can no longer be determined (comp. Heinrici, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1876, 4; 77, 1 and *das erste Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus an die Cor.*, Berlin, 1880). But it must not be forgotten that the relations of Church-life were still very simple, nor could it be reasonably disputed even by Holsten that there was only one Church chest. On the other hand we are told incidentally that in the Church of the port of Corinth in Cenchrea, which was certainly but small, there was a deaconess (Rom. xvi. 1 f.); and although her designation as *πρόστατις* has been supposed to point to a kind of patronage, yet the *πολλῶν καὶ ἐμοῦ* makes it quite impossible that anything can be meant but actual care, such as in the exercise of her calling she had devoted to many.

4. This danger had reached its culminating point when, after the departure of Apollos from Corinth, owing to which the Apostle had not yet heard anything of the movement, dissension broke out in the Church respecting the prerogatives of the various teachers, that directly threatened the Church with dissolution into several parties. The movement probably originated with the followers of Apollos, who preferred the more philosophic and trained rhetorical preaching of the Alexandrian to the manner of Paul, which was simpler in form and substance, and who now, as disciples of Apollos, formed themselves into a sort of party.¹ But the immediate result of this was, that others

¹ It is quite without reason when Heinrici still maintains that Apollos attached greater weight to baptism and its personal application. The undisturbed relation of Paul to Apollos (1 Cor. xvi. 12) excludes all idea of a fundamental opposition on the part of his disciples to the Pauline majority of the Church.

in the Church, who had had another teacher than Paul, grouped themselves similarly round the name of their teacher; thus arose the party of the disciples of Cephas, who, to judge by the way in which Paul recognises in Cephas only such pre-eminence as all could and should appropriate to themselves (iii. 22), cannot have been in fundamental opposition to him.² The true followers of the actual founder of the Church had finally no alternative but to form themselves likewise into a kind of Pauline party (i. 12). The extent of this Corinthian division into parties has generally been very much over-estimated; the parties were by no means such in our sense of the word, as distinguished by different views and aims. The continued attempts to attribute to one or other of these parties all that our first Epistle intimates as to differences of opinion, errors and doubts, have utterly failed. The natural consequence of such attempts has been that almost every trait has been attributed sometimes to one party and sometimes to another; the picture thus formed of each individual party being different with each expositor. The adherents of the respective parties cannot have made nationality the basis of their separation, since there must certainly have been Jewish

² Consequently, since the disciples of Cephas cannot have adopted this name because they represented certain fundamental principles or doctrines of Peter in opposition to those of Paul, the question arises how did it happen that so great a number of disciples of Cephas should have been found in Corinth, since only individuals who had been converted by Peter in Judea could have gone to settle in that city. But in this case what Dionysius of Corinth relates of a ministry of Peter in that place (ap. Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, 2, 25) can scarcely be regarded as an arbitrary inference from 1 Cor. i. 12, though that is commonly done. It is certainly an error on his part to regard him as associated with Paul in the founding of the Church, but it cannot be affirmed that he did not come here on one of his missionary journeys to the Diaspora, as mentioned by Paul in ix. 5, bringing with him a large number of Jewish Christian members of the Church; the very way in which Paul speaks particularly of his missionary journeys is strongly in favour of this view, as Harnack has lately acknowledged.

Christians among the disciples both of Paul and Apollos; while it is not unlikely that among the disciples of Cephas there were also some uncircumcised individuals, who even as proselytes, adhered to the synagogue. It undoubtedly follows from iv. 6-8, that each one asserted the pre-eminence of his teacher over the others; and believed he had already attained the full height of Christian development by what he had received from him. The Hellenic spirit, always accustomed to party-strife, thus found food for its subjectivity, its vanity, and its love of contention. Of an official separation of the Church, there was no word as yet; nor had the Church as such written to the Apostle (vii. 1), who invariably speaks of the Church-meeting as united (xi. 20, xiv. 23). The worst feature in the case was that Paul was thus thrust farther and farther from the position of the acknowledged highest authority in the Church into that of a party leader.

5. The confusion in the picture that has been drawn of this party-strife, is due to the circumstance that Paul seems to place a fourth party by the side of the three already named, the watchword of whose adherents was, ἐγὼ (εἰμι) Χριστοῦ (1 Cor. i. 12).¹ Eichhorn regarded this as the neutral party which, according to Schott and Bleek, was expressly approved by the Apostle himself. And in order to justify the equality with the others that is manifestly attributed to it, it was generally held that this party too asserted its adherence to Christ in some exclusive way. But this view that has become prevalent, particularly with more recent commentators, as Rückert, Meyer, Hofmann, and Heinrici, and is also represented by Hausrath and Neander

¹ An attempt was already made by Chrysostom, and recently again by Mayerhoff (*Hist. krit. Einl. in die petrin. Schriften*, Hamb., 1835), to make these words refer only to what Paul said in opposition to the three parties, and by Rübiger to regard them as the watchword equally claimed by all three; but this cannot be carried out in opposition to the simple wording, which puts it quite on a par with the other three.

(in his later years) gives no vivid picture of the party and has no support whatever in the epistle. The same thing may be said of all attempts to form an *à priori* conception of the peculiar character of the party in question.

Hug and Bertholdt following Storr, regarded them as disciples of James, calling themselves by the name of Christ because James was a brother of the Lord; Osiander in his Commentary (Stuttg., 1847, 58), as Ebionites, who looked on Christ only as a teacher; while Ewald makes them adherents of an Essene-minded teacher, who, taking a particular evangelical writing as his authority, disapproved of marriage after the example of Christ. Neander, on the other hand, regarded them (at least at first) as Gentile-Christians, who looked upon Christ as a new Socrates, and rejected Apostolic tradition as alloyed with Judaism; while Guericke and Olshausen adopt the same opinion. Jäger too supposed them to be at least a combination of Jewish Christianity and Greek learning (*Erklärung d. Briefe Pauli an die Kor. aus dem Gesichtspunkt der vier Part.*, Tübing., 1838); Goldhorn (in Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.*, 1840, 2) and Dähne (*die Christuspartei*, Halle, 1842) sought to prove that they were characterized by a Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy of religion, while Kniewel (*Eccl. Cor. vetust. dissensiones et turbæ*, Gedan., 1841) looked on them as precursors of the Gnostics, a conclusion to which Neander had already come. Since the New Testament beginnings of Gnosticism are certainly connected with theosophic Jewish Christianity, this view has some affinity with that of Schenkel (*De Eccl. Cor. primæva.*, Basel, 1838, comp. *das Christusbild der Apostel.*, Leipz., 1879), which tried to find an actual hold in our epistles, making the polemic of the second refer to them, although it never attacks a party in the Church but only individual intruders. He supposed them to be theosophically educated Jewish Christians, who looked on their relation to Christ as mediated by visions and revelations, as contrasted with the apostolic mediation; and de Wette, Lutterbeck, Grimm and Niedner (comp. also Wieseler, *zur Gesch. d. NTlichen Schrift.*, Leipz., 1880) assented.

It is the great merit of Baur that here too he has been the first to put the inquiry on a firm historical basis (comp. *Tübinger Zeitschr. f. Theol.*, 1831, 1; 1836, 4), since he succeeded in definitely combining the catchword of 1 Cor. i. 12 with that to which Paul alludes in 2 Cor. x. 7, thus finding in the former passage the Jewish-Christian opponents of the

apostles, who are combated in the second Epistle. In this way he was led to unite the disciples of Cephas with those of Christ, as Chr. Schmidt after his own method had already done, since both parties put the authority of the primitive apostles, as of those who by personal intercourse with Christ were alone qualified, in opposition to Paul, and are said to have rejected his apostleship; at least the *οἱ Χριστοῦ* must have been the heads of the party. Billroth (in his *Komm.*, Leipz., 1833), Credner and Reuss tried to separate them as the violent party, more definitely from the Petrines; while Becker (*die Parteiung in der Gem. zu Cor.*, Alton., 1842) on the contrary regarded them as the milder party, whose members, because converted by Paul, could not have joined the Petrines. It was Beyschlag (*De Eccl. Cor. Factione Christ.*, Halle, 1861, comp. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1865, 2; 1871, 4) who first emphatically maintained that the very existence in Corinth of a Cephas party, directly distinguished from the Jewish-Christian opponents of the Apostle, and evidently regarded by Paul (iii. 22) as being in no material opposition to himself, shows most clearly that the primitive apostles themselves did not stand in hostile relation to Paul (comp. also Klöpffer, *Exeg. krit. Untersuchungen über den 2. Brief des Paulus an die Gem. zu Corinth.*, Gött., 1869; *Comm. zu 2. Cor.*, Berlin, 1874, and Holtzmann). Even Holsten, recently followed by Mangold, admits an essential distinction between the disciples of Cephas and the *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ* with their violent hostility to Paul, while Hilgenfeld, after the precedent of Grotius and Thiersch, distinguishes them from the latter only as being direct disciples of Christ, which was also the opinion of Beyschlag and Holsten. But the latter alone has clearly recognised that in this case the current idea of the *οἱ Χριστοῦ* as a party consisting of members of the Corinthian Church, must be definitely abandoned, since the special relation to Christ which the term, however understood, indicates, could only be predicated of themselves

by individual teachers who had come to Corinth, but never by their followers.²

6. The critical point was that the state of the Corinthian Church offered the most favourable ground for the agitation of the Apostle's Jewish-Christian adversaries. In a Church in which the excesses of the free Gentile-Christians and the prevailing differences of opinion on important questions showed undoubted necessity for a legal regulation of the Christian life, they had apparently a just title to come forward as *διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης* (2 Cor. xi. 15); and in a Church where the name of the Apostle was still used only in the sense of a party leader, they might look for the readiest success if they could attack the gospel that rested on his authority, with effect. They were native Jews, who came from abroad with letters of recommendation to Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 22, iii. 1), and there represented themselves as *διάκονοι Χριστοῦ*, and even as apostles of Christ (xi. 13, 23), while Paul sometimes designates them ironically as *ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι* (xi. 5, xii. 11), and again openly calls them *ψευδαπόστολοι* (xi. 13). If they founded their claim to this character on their special relation to Christ (x. 7: *εἴ τις πέποιθεν ἑαυτῷ Χριστοῦ εἶναι*), it can only have been they who said of themselves, *ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ* (1 Cor. i. 12),¹ and after the

² This has indeed already been remarked by others; but it has been customary to rest satisfied with the fact that the other parties also cannot have been composed of purely personal disciples of Paul and Apollos, particularly the Cephas-party, which can only be asserted of the latter if we shut our eyes to the view put forward in No. 4, note 2. But it is not possible to understand the *οἱ Παύλου*, *οἱ Ἀπόλλω*, *οἱ Κηφᾶ* as applying either in word or substance to such as shared the views of these men; and even if possible, it would not prove that *οἱ Χριστοῦ* referred to such as gave the preference to Christ before all other teachers, on account of the direct relation borne by the primitive apostles or their teachers to him.

¹ It is vain to put forward the *ἐκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει* against the reference of the *ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ* to the Judaistic errorists. The question turns on the interpretation of the Apostle's meaning when he says he has heard, *ὅτι ἐριδες ἐν ὑμῖν εἰσίν* (vers. 11). And since these very disciples of Christ

analogy of parallel expressions in this passage, the term can only mean that they were immediate disciples of Christ, since they made this discipleship the basis of their title to preach another Jesus and another gospel than Paul's (2 Cor. xi. 4).

The supposition put forward by the Tübingen school, that these Jewish Christians could only have come from the primitive apostles and from Jerusalem with letters of commendation, since the latter alone could give them authority as servants and apostles of Christ in the eyes of the Corinthians, contradicts 2 Cor. iii., since Paul there puts these letters of commendation quite on a par with those that he had received from the Corinthians. It does not even follow from the fact of their being Hebrews (xi. 22) that they came from Palestine; since Paul, a Jew of the dispersion, makes the same claim. The only probability in favour of this view is the fact that they professed to be direct disciples of Christ, in which case it would certainly be natural that their letters of recommendation should have come from Jerusalem. But even then it would by no means follow that they had been drawn up by the primitive apostles, since Holsten himself concedes that there were very diverse currents of opinion in Jerusalem. If this were the case, however, still it would not follow that the praise lavished on them by the primitive apostles gave them authority for their anti-Pauline agitation (in particular comp. § 21, 5, note 2). The importance formerly attributed by Baur to the appearance of these Judaists for his adopted view of the hostile relation between Paul and the primitive apostles has its basis in the fact that he looked on those whom they professed to represent in opposition to Paul, and whom the latter so ironically characterizes as *ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι*, as the primitive apostles (comp. also Hilgenfeld); but even Holsten most distinctly admits that the passages in question, judged by the context, refer only to themselves. This does away with all possibility of proving from the Corinthian Epistle, as Holsten still endeavours to do, that a Judaistic reaction took place in the Church subsequent to the dispute at Antioch, though solely under the guidance of James, not to speak of the assumption of a hostile position towards Paul on the part of the primitive apostles.

had undoubtedly contributed most towards sharpening and embittering party disturbances, and since they were only too readily received by the Church in which they now laboured as teachers highly esteemed by many, he was at liberty to put their watchword beside that of the other parties. But the fact that he has so done, shows plainly that the section (iv. 18 ff.) in which these disturbances are discussed has reference to those *τινές*.

It is certainly from the second Epistle that we first learn more of these anti-Pauline Judaists; but it is clear beyond doubt that Paul already knew of their appearance when writing the first Epistle, from the fact that in concluding the exhortation against party divisions, he speaks of such as are puffed up with the idea that he can no longer go to Corinth, and promises, if he comes, to prove, not τὸν λόγον but τὴν δύναμιν of these πεφυσιωμένοι (1 Cor. iv. 18 ff.). These can only have been teachers who thought themselves of more consequence than Paul, and who supposed that after their appearing, he would not dare to meet them face to face.³ But ix. 1-3. equally implies that there were those who doubted his apostleship and rejected his apostolic authority where they themselves were concerned; it is also plain from ix. 12 that those who, in return for their ministry, claimed to be supported by the Church, were preachers of the gospel. It is manifest that hitherto they had not come forward directly with their legal doctrine, for the experiences of the Judaists in Galatia might have taught them that they could effect nothing in this direction unless the authority of the Apostle were first undermined. But it was obviously impossible to attempt this by means of rough polemic, until they themselves had gained a firm footing in the Church.

³ Hilgenfeld has indeed made an elaborate attempt to show, in opposition to the express statement of the Apostle (iv. 6), that the greatest part of the section against party strife has reference to the Judaists, as well as much else in the epistle that has nothing whatever to do with them. Even the passage iii. 16 f., cannot, in accordance with the context, be referred to the Judaists, but only to the destruction of the Church by party discord. Whether iii. 23 alludes to the shibboleth of the disciples of Christ, is very doubtful, since the ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ is certainly taken in another sense; and only if such were the allusion, would it rightly follow, that those who claimed this Χριστοῦ εἶναι did not belong to the Church as such. It would be more natural to suppose that the ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας (iv. 3), as contrasted with the ὑφ' ἑμῶν δρακίθῳ, had reference to them, although the mode of expression makes this improbable. But it cannot by any means be proved that the introductory greeting has reference to them (i. 2), as Holsten maintains.

To this end therefore it was necessary to direct their first efforts; and it was probably only this endeavour to establish their position as highly favoured apostles owing to their personal intercourse with Christ, that led them incidentally to throw doubt on the apostleship of Paul who had not this privilege, and to express the opinion that after apostles like themselves had appeared, with the intention of devoting themselves permanently to the Church, Paul would even forbear to come again to Corinth. But according to all the accounts that had hitherto reached Paul, the Judaists can have made no great impression on the Church at first. This fully explains why he makes no further mention of them in the first Epistle; it would have been unwise to open a polemic on his side, until he knew in what form they would come forward with their final aims which he undoubtedly saw through.³

³ Holsten's view that Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus pacified the Church that was already stirred up against him, or at least pacified him with the assurance that the Judaists would gain no influence over the Church, and thus induced him to refrain from directly attacking them (comp. also Mangold), has no support whatever in 1 Cor. xvi. 17 f. Moreover, since even in 2 Cor. xii. 12, Paul only refers to the *σημεία τοῦ ἀποστόλου* in connection with a comparison of himself with the Judaists who were active in Corinth, it is clear that the doubts of his apostleship (ix. 1) by no means pointed to a comparison with the primitive apostles. But since we have failed to find such parallel even in the Epistle to the Galatians (§ 18, 4, note 1, 2), the current notion that the struggle between the Judaists and Paul turned mainly on his claim to be an apostle which was denied in favour of the primitive apostles, very recently defended with great energy by Holtzmann (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1879, 4), is quite untenable. It is doubly contradicted by the fact that these disciples of Christ also gave themselves out as apostles, and that Paul by no means impugns the abstract possibility that there might be other apostles besides himself and the primitive apostles (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 7), but declares these to be *ψευδαπόστολοι* on account of their mode of acting (2 Cor. xi. 13). Even in 1 Cor. ix. 1 f., the question turns essentially on his apostolic authority where the Corinthians are concerned, and only incidentally does he touch the subject at all, since he does not claim the right to be supported by the Church, which he so energetically defends as an apostolic privilege, but expressly asserts the claim in the case of all

7. The first accounts received by Paul respecting the unsatisfactory relations in Corinth, came from the people of a certain Chloe, and referred mainly to the latest party dissensions (1 Cor. i. 11). What he heard seemed serious enough to make it desirable to send Timothy at once to Corinth. He evidently cherished the hope that the appearance at Corinth of his beloved spiritual child would suffice to recall to the memory of the whole Church so vivid a picture of their spiritual father, that the dust in which party strife had enveloped them would disappear, and the Church would strive to emulate the example of his humble, self-sacrificing life. They would learn from Timothy that he desired nothing different from them than from all his Churches (iv. 14-17). It is this sending of Timothy that the Acts put into the third year of Paul's sojourn at Ephesus (xix. 22). He travelled on that occasion through Macedonia with a certain Erastus, perhaps the city-chamberlain from Corinth, who had by chance been in Ephesus (Rom. xvi. 23), and therefore took the land route to Corinth. From 1 Cor. xvi. 11 some other Ephesians who had business in Corinth, seem also to have travelled with them. Paul would have preferred that Apollos had gone instead of Timothy, but the latter was detained by urgent business (xvi. 12).¹ Paul, however, was soon destined to learn how inadequate this measure was.

preachers of the gospel (ix. 14, comp. vers. 5 f.). The importance attributed in apostolic times to the apostolic name as such is in fact commonly overestimated.

¹ It is generally assumed that Apollos declined the proposed journey on account of the abuse made of his name in Corinth, in spite of Paul's urgent entreaties; but the promise that he would come when he had time, points too decidedly to the above-named motive. He probably found abundant opportunity in Asia Minor for a fruitful ministry.

§ 20. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

1. Not long after the departure of Timothy, a deputation arrived at Ephesus from Corinth. Stephanas and his two companions Fortunatus and Achaicus, who seem in some way to have belonged to his house, had volunteered to go to the Apostle at Ephesus, in order by their presence to renew the bond between him and the Church, the loosening of which had therefore been felt, at least in certain circles (1 Cor. xvi. 17 f.; comp. ver. 15), and to take a letter to the Church, in which the Apostle's view respecting various questions of Christian life that had been matter of controversy in the Church, was solicited, probably with special reference to the marriage question (vii. 1).¹ These men, who took so warm an interest in the affairs of the Church, had unquestionably a still more comprehensive object in their journey. They wished to give the Apostle a more minute account as to the many distressing relations in the Church; and from them Paul first learned all that we can gather on this subject from his first Epistle, in particular with regard to party spirit in that city (§ 19); in addition probably to many details that he purposely avoids mentioning. Paul recognised that it was high time to take energetic measures for the regeneration of the deeply degraded

¹ Whether with regard also to the eating of flesh offered in sacrifice and to gifts of grace, cannot be determined with certainty from viii. 1, xii. 1; but the way in which Hofmann and Heinrici seek to determine every detail of what the epistle contained on every single point, or in which Holtzmann settles the arrangement of the epistle from the Apostle's own discussions and the answers to the Church-letters, goes far beyond what can with certainty be gathered from the text. The conjecture that the epistle, which unquestionably proceeded from the Church as a whole and not from a single party, was an answer to the lost epistle of Paul, is quite improbable (§ 19, 1); but the view that the delegates who brought it were the people of Chloe mentioned in i. 11, is certainly false, since according to xvi. 10, Timothy, whom Paul had sent away after receiving the accounts of these people, had evidently set out already.

Church, and that the mission of Timothy was far from sufficient for this purpose. The most natural idea was that he should at once proceed thither himself. Besides, he had already promised the Church, probably in the last epistle (comp. 2 Cor. i. 13 ff.), to make a journey of visitation to the Macedonian Churches which he had long since planted (Acts xix. 21); arranging that he should go to Corinth by way of the sea, passing thence to Macedonia, and returning again to Corinth and there embarking for the East (2 Cor. i. 15 f.). Deeply agitated as he was on account of much that he had heard from Corinth, he must have gone to them with words of severe censure, and have distressed the Church as well as himself, instead of his visit proving a source of mutual pleasure. He could not make up his mind to this (i. 23-ii. 3). He might possibly have tried once more to persuade Apollos to undertake the journey to Corinth; but since he gives no greeting from him, the latter must have been already absent from Ephesus. The Apostle had therefore no alternative but to give the returning delegates a letter in which, by the most forcible language, he sought to put an end to the existing evils; that on his next visit he might have unalloyed pleasure in seeing the Church again (ii. 3). His task was difficult enough. His love toward the Church which he would not willingly afflict, constantly strove with his anger on account of its evil condition, with the severity and even bitterness that indignation against its conduct had aroused in him; he wrote in much affliction and with many tears (ii. 3). Since the messengers unquestionably returned by the shortest way, they would reach Corinth before Timothy, whom he announces and commends through them, and whose return he would await at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 10 f.). It seems to have been about Easter-tide, for in v. 6-8, he is manifestly still taken up with impressions of the festival. He would remain at Ephesus until Pentecost, in order to carry on his ministry

that was there so richly blessed (xvi. 8 f.), would then pass through Macedonia to Corinth, where he would make a longer stay, probably for the winter (xvi. 5-7), and whence he would set out on his long-projected collection-journey to Jerusalem (xvi. 3 f., comp. Acts xix. 21).³

2. Whether Sosthenes, who takes part in the introductory greeting of the Apostle, was the chief ruler of the synagogue at Corinth, formerly so hostile to him (Acts xviii. 17), but afterwards converted, we do not know; it is by no means impossible. For the rest, the very way in which the Apostle speaks of himself in the inscription emphasizes his Divine authority, just as his characterization of the Church reminds them that they are sanctified in life-communion with Christ, and are, by virtue of their calling, bound to the worshippers of Christ in every place, in order to impress on them their obligation to lay aside all uncleanness and all division among themselves, as well as all departure by arbitrary innovation from universal Christian usage (1 Cor. i. 1 f.). In the same way the thanksgiving recalls the riches of the gifts bestowed upon them, and expresses his confidence that God would keep them blameless to the day of Christ, in which, by having called them, He had given them the hope of the fulfilment of salvation (i. 4-9). We feel how the Apostle forces himself to begin with words of recognition and of hope, as contrasted with the

³ The historical place of the epistle is thus quite clear; and it is scarcely worth while mentioning that Böttger supposes it to have been written in South Achaia, while Köhler, on the basis of the old subscription, which rests on a misunderstanding of xvi. 5, maintains that it was composed at Philippi, after the deliverance from the Roman captivity. The Acts put the plan of the journey to Jerusalem through Macedonia and Achaia after the two years of the Apostle's exclusively Gentile-Christian ministry in Ephesus, consequently in the 2nd third of his 3rd year in that place, making the Apostle purposely stay there some time afterwards (xix. 21 f.). Hence the first Corinthian Epistle falls near the middle of this year, according to the usual computation (comp. § 18, 7, note 2) about Easter, 58.

agitated introduction to the Galatian Epistle. Even in speaking of what lies nearest to his heart, viz. the laying aside of party-spirit, he begins with a calm exhortation to unanimity of mind, pointing out that he had done nothing to attach them to his own name and person instead of to the name of Christ, which ought to be their bond of union (i. 10-16). He then goes straight to the point where the strife between the disciples of Apollos and his own adherents had begun, and in which the question turned on the superiority of the preaching of Apollos to his own. In an entirely theoretical exposition, he develops the fact that the gospel entrusted to him preached only Christ and His cross, and yet, in spite of its apparent foolishness and weakness, put to shame all human wisdom and efficacy; that God had for this very reason called those who were destitute of all wisdom and other human privileges, that men should boast only of Christ and the salvation given in Him (i. 17-31), thus explaining (ii. 1-4) why, in laying the basis of his preaching among them, he had renounced all human wisdom and rhetorical art (such as was commended so highly in Apollos).¹ The gospel certainly contained depths of Divine wisdom that would be revealed to its preachers by the Spirit of God by whom likewise they would be instructed in their ministry, but which, for this very reason, could only be understood by the spiritual man (ii. 5-16). The fact that they had not yet reached this stage, and that therefore he could not

¹ We here see how necessary it was for the Apostle to look at the concrete questions of which he had to treat, under the aspect of comprehensive principles. His statement that the gospel of the Crucified One was, in the nature of things, foolishness to the wisdom-seeking Greeks, and a stumbling-block to the Jews who required a sign; yet to those who were called among both, proved itself to be the power of God and the wisdom of God (i. 22 ff.), has nothing whatever to do with the differences of parties, to which Holsten makes it refer, but only serves to establish what he wants to say respecting the true manner of Evangelical preaching.

reveal these things to them, was best shown by their carnal rivalry and strife respecting the names of men (iii. 1-4). He now first alludes directly to the actual distinction between himself and Apollos, which rests entirely on the special gift with which each one is endowed by God, for the use of which he is responsible, as well as for the success thus obtained (iii. 5-15). But they were responsible if (by their party dissension) they destroyed the temple of God, *i.e.* the Church, giving the preference to man's wisdom, although the prerogatives of all separate teachers belonged to them all (iii. 16-23). The servants of Christ are raised above their criticism (as well as their preference) by their responsibility to the Lord (iv. 1-5). Paul purposely treats the whole question of party strife respecting the pre-eminence of teachers, only in its relation to Apollos, where he was safe from all suspicion of envious or hostile depreciation; and only once, where individual precedence comes into question, does he name Cephas (iii. 22); but all that was said naturally applied to the latter as well as to the disciples of Christ, and was intended to put an end to boasting on both sides (iv. 6). In the course of the discussion, however, which was apparently so calm and clear, sharp and threatening words respecting the Corinthians and their doings had already escaped him (iii. 1-4, 16-18); in iv. 3, the tone of apostolic self-consciousness deeply injured by this weighing and criticising of the servants of Christ is already heard; yet the deep indignation of the Apostle at the vain arrogance and satisfied self-complacency thus shown, breaks forth with vehemence that is almost startling, finding vent in bitter words, in which he contrasts with this picture that of the official life of an apostle, rich only in humiliations, privations, and sufferings (iv. 7-13). Then he resumes the tone of tender love to his spiritual children, to whom for their good he had sent his beloved son Timothy, without however abandoning his intention of a personal visit, the

manner of which would depend on their own conduct (iv. 14-21).

3. With cutting severity he proceeds to contrast their puffed up pride with the humiliation they had incurred by so much as suffering the presence of the fornicator in their midst, whom he had intended to deliver over to Satan by way of an exemplary punishment, in case the Church had shown itself of one mind with him, and now gives his reasons for categorically demanding his excommunication (v. 1-13). So too they dishonoured themselves by seeking justice at heathen tribunals, as if there were none of themselves wise enough to settle the disputes of the brethren respecting property, which indeed are in themselves degrading enough when it is remembered that all heathen sins of lust and avarice exclude from the kingdom of God, and that they as Christians are essentially separated from such (vi. 1-11). He is thus led back to sins of unchastity, and in opposition to the heathen view, which is disposed to regard such sins as a matter of indifference, he unfolds in a masterly way the Christian reasons for which unchastity is to be shunned as a sin against one's own body (vi. 12-20). In this connection he is led to speak of the enquiries in their letter with respect to marriage, laying down as a first principle the fact that marriage, viz. the consummation of marriage, which from a moral point of view he represents as a right and obligation on the part both of husband and wife, serves as a protection against temptation to unchastity, and that no choice of an abstinent life on principle, such as he decidedly preferred, should prevent marriage where the gift of abstinence was lacking (vii. 1-9). With respect to divorce, he appeals to the decisive utterance of the Lord which forbids it, justifying its application to mixed marriages, on the plea that in the divinely ordained bond of marriage, the consecration of the Christian passes over to the heathen party, from whose natural uncleanness contamination need

not therefore be feared, but also lays down the position that the Christian should make no conscientious scruple if the heathen wish to separate from him (vii. 10-16). He finds here only an application of the universal Christian principle according to which each one should remain in the position in which he was when called (vii. 17-24),¹ and shows how this rule applied to virgins would prevent their marrying. In his view, that had at least some claim to credibility, they would only be thus exempted from heavy troubles, while their religious duty would be made easier (vii. 25-34). In individual cases, however, the answer to the question as to whether a man ought to marry a virgin or not, depended on her natural disposition and his own conscientious conviction (vii. 35-38). So too the widow has a perfect right to enter into a second marriage, presuming that it is a Christian one, although, according to his spiritually enlightened view, it would be happier for her not to do so (vii. 39 f.).²

4. The controversy respecting the marriage question is

¹ The way in which Paul traces the prohibition of divorce back to this principle, which he then applies to the greatest differences of religious life and social position, such as were certainly not in question in Corinth, again shows how necessary it was to the Apostle, even where a categorical command of the Lord was in question, to get at its deepest principle and all its consequences. It was this principle, which according to his declaration he proclaimed in all the Churches, that preserved Christianity from revolutionary byways and led to the spontaneous regeneration of the dispositions of natural life. Moreover, it follows most clearly from the first application he makes of it (ver. 18 f.), that in spite of his doctrine of essential freedom from the law, the Jew must remain a Jew in his manner of life (unless released from such obligation by special command of God) when called to be a Christian, as well as from its second application to the Christian slave, who is voluntarily to serve God in this state and not wilfully to strive for freedom.

² It is vain to try to determine separately which of these arguments rest on definite inquiries put by the Church, or are directed against definite errors, since Paul has put the whole question in such comprehensive and luminous grouping that his peculiarity of style and not accident must have been the determining cause.

naturally followed by that concerning the eating of flesh offered to idols. Paul freely declares in favour of those who see no idolatrous defilement in eating such food, because there are no divine beings such as the heathen by their idols represent (viii. 1-6). But there are some who have not this knowledge, whose conscience is defiled by such eating; hence those to whom it is a matter of indifference must give up their liberty lest they should lead their weak brethren to act in opposition to conscience (viii. 7-12). Pointing to his own conduct in this respect (viii. 13), he explains it by the fundamental principles of his official life. He will not contend respecting his claim to be an apostle (ix. 1-3); but the right to be supported by the Church belongs to all preachers of the gospel. This is attested by the very nature of the thing as well as by the Old Testament interpreted allegorically and typically, and by the express command of the Lord (ix. 4-14); nevertheless he had renounced his claim for the sake of the gospel (ix. 19-23). He feels himself free with respect to all men; yet to the Jews he is a Jew, to the Gentiles a Gentile, to the weak as weak, for the gospel's sake (ix. 19-23). Such self-denial for the sake of the brethren also promotes the life of the individual Christian, inasmuch as all such practice strengthens the power to resist temptation (ix. 24-27). How necessary this is may be seen from the typical history of Israel, who, notwithstanding many experiences of grace, succumbed to temptation in the wilderness (x. 1-13). Participation in food offered to idols must therefore be unconditionally abandoned on account of the temptations inevitably associated with it (x. 14-22);¹ while even with respect to

¹ In x. 1-4 the Apostle has already intimated that the experiences of grace made by all Christians in baptism and the last supper, are quite analogous to Israel's experiences of grace in the wilderness. He here goes back to the last supper in order, from the real communion with the body and blood of Christ effected by partaking of the cup of blessing

such things as are in themselves allowable, consideration for others must be the rule of action, as in his own case (x. 23-xi. 1).

5. Paul then passes on to the disorders that prevailed in the Church-meetings. He first censures the unveiling of the women during the hours of devotion, which he declares to be a repudiation on the part of the woman of that subjection to man to which she was appointed in the order of creation, without prejudice to her religious equality, stigmatizing it as a violation of the modesty which nature itself teaches woman, by giving her a veil of long hair; for man alone may stand before God with uncovered head (xi. 3-15).¹ The Apostle also takes advantage of the disorders at the love-feasts, to censure which few words are required (xi. 17-22; comp. vers. 33 f.), in order, by a detailed account of the revelation he had received respecting the aim and meaning of the Lord's Supper, to enforce the sacred duty of preparation for it (xi. 23-33), reserving other instructions until he should visit them in person (xi. 34). Finally he introduces the section relative to the dispute respecting gifts of the Spirit, by a detailed discussion, showing how these, notwithstanding their great diversity, are the work of *one* Spirit, which has its infallible sign in the confession of Christ, and unites the members of the Church into one original body by means of these gifts (xii. 1-14). Following up this imagery, he now explains in drastic, half parabolic form how the higher gifts

and the broken bread, as well as from the analogy of the Jewish sacrificial meal which mediates participation in the Divine presence at the altar (x. 16-18), to show that the heathen sacrificial meal brought about a real communion with demons, to whom offering is thus made, referring naturally to the seductive influences that made these meals an incitement to wantonness and lust.

¹ From the fact that he finally puts an end to all further discussion of this question of decorum by an appeal to common Christian custom (xi. 16), just as he began it by a reference to his tradition (xi. 2), we see clearly how necessary it was for him to go to the very foundation even of such questions as this, and to answer accordingly.

are not to be overrated nor the inferior ones despised, since each member is in its own way equally necessary to the body, for which reason God has, by implanting a natural feeling of shame and beauty, so ordained that the subordinate members are indemnified for that wherein they are lacking, by more careful veiling and adornment; suffering as well as honour drawing all the other members into sympathy (xii. 15-26). Then after making a second application of the image to the body of Christ, with its members having divers gifts (xii. 27-30), he promises to show them the way that leads to coveting of the higher gifts (xii. 31). This is followed by the splendid hymn in praise of love without which all other gifts are of no value; which alone is imperishable, whereas others cease with the second coming,—greater even than faith and hope, which are important only where the life of the individual is concerned, while the gift of love tends to foster the life of the Church (xiii. 1-13). From this point of view he again enters fundamentally into the distinction between prophecy, which was a specific gift for the edification of the Church, and the ecstatic speaking with tongues of which we have here so vivid a picture. The latter serves at most for self-edification, but is quite valueless to the Church (xiv. 1-19), and if carried to an extreme, cannot even attain its relative importance as a sign to unbelievers (xiv. 20-25). Accordingly he proceeds by concrete precepts to regulate the conduct of speakers with tongues, who are only to let themselves be heard when one who has the gift of interpreting tongues is present; as also of the prophets, who can and must give way to a fresh burst of inspiration in another (xiv. 26-33). Referring to Christian custom, he categorically forbids women to come forward in the Church-meetings (xiv. 34-36), appealing once more to the judgment of those who are spiritually gifted themselves and to the necessity of fixed arrangements for the service of the Church (xiv. 37-40).

6. The 15th chapter, directed against those who doubt the resurrection of the dead, is a masterpiece of Pauline doctrine. He sets out with the resurrection of Christ, which, as the chief subject of all preaching, was attested by so many witnesses of His appearances, even down to himself (xv. 1-11). He shows how the assumption that there can be no resurrection of the dead is thus refuted, unless we are to give up the fact of Christ's resurrection which is the foundation of our saving faith and Christian hope (xv. 12-19); how, on the contrary, the resurrection of Christ is a guarantee for that of those who believe in Him, although this can only ensue at His second coming, when, after the conquest of death as the last enemy, the fulness of the kingdom of God is to begin (xv. 20-28). He appeals to the presumption of this certainty contained in the custom of the Church, as well as in his own joy in the prospect of death; and concludes with a sharp reprimand for the way in which by their heathen intercourse they had allowed themselves to be robbed of all Christian sobriety (xv. 29-34). He also takes up the question of the resurrection body, and pointing to the symbol of the seed sown, and to the great diversity between bodies in heaven and upon earth (xv. 35-41), explains how the nature of the resurrection body will certainly be directly opposite to that of the earthly human body, viz. a spiritual nature, which the Second Adam first received at the resurrection, just as our earthly psychical nature comes from the first Adam (xv. 42-59). Then, in prophetic flight, he rises to a description of that great final catastrophe, when with the resurrection of the dead and the change of those that survive, the victory over death to which sin gave power over us, will be accomplished by Christ (xv. 51-58). This exhausts the subject of his epistle. He now touches upon some arrangements respecting the collection for Jerusalem that had evidently been already suggested to them, as he had likewise done in Galatia, and reminds them that in case

the collection prove large, they are to choose bearers of it to be his fellow-travellers, whereupon he promises to visit them in the winter (xvi. 1-9). In the meantime he had evidently begun to doubt whether, under existing circumstances at Corinth, as represented to him by the latest accounts, Timothy would find the desired reception; and since the messengers who were returning direct would arrive before Timothy who was travelling through Macedonia, he urgently exhorts them not to intimidate or despise him when he should arrive; explaining at the same time why he had not sent Apollos instead, and concluding with a comprehensive admonition (xvi. 10-14). Then follows by way of subscription a warm recommendation of the returning messengers, together with greetings from the Churches of Asia, from his hosts and the whole Ephesian Church (xvi. 15-20). But he accompanies the greeting in his own hand with a terrible and earnest exhortation to those who love not the Lord, in view of His second coming, and remembering the hard words he was obliged to address to many, with an assurance of his love to all (xvi. 21-24).

7. The danger that threatened the Apostle owing to the revolt stirred up by Demetrius the silversmith among the workers of his craft, because his trade, and hence, it was alleged, the honour of the great Diana of Ephesus already began to suffer considerable loss through Christianity, belongs to the latter part of his stay at Ephesus. Two Macedonian companions of Paul, Gaius and Aristarchus, were dragged into the theatre; but the efforts of the Apostle's friends and of certain chiefs of Asia were successful in preventing him from going thither. The growing crowd, not rightly knowing what matter was in dispute, became still more frenzied when a certain Alexander, whom the Jews put forward because they feared that they might be set upon, began an apologetic address to his people, till at last the town clerk interfered, referring Demetrius and his companions to

the ordinary law courts, and threatening punishment for the revolt. Thus it came about that the storm passed over without danger (Acts xix. 23-41); but the Apostle nevertheless felt impelled to leave the city on this account (xx. 1). We do not know whether or to what extent the Apostle's intended stay was curtailed by this incident, nor yet whether it was the fanaticism he had kindled that followed him on his farther journey through Asia Minor, and, as it appears (2 Cor. vii. 5), even into Macedonia; but it is certain that in Asia he got into a difficulty that made him give up all hope of life, and from which he was saved only as by a miracle (i. 8-10). But anxiety as to the impression his letter had made in Corinth and the effect of it tormented the Apostle almost more than this outward affliction. When he came to Troas and did not find the news he had hoped for, his anxiety became so great that he was unable to make use of the fine opportunity for evangelical work that there presented itself to him, and went on at once to Macedonia (ii. 12 f.).

It strikes us as strange that he expected this news through Titus and not through Timothy, who in accordance with his former intentions must have reached that place after the arrival of his letter, and who was now with him again in Macedonia (i. 1), without a hint of his having brought him any news.¹ Hence it follows undoubtedly that

¹ An attempt has been made to explain this on the assumption that it was the first account brought by Timothy that put the Apostle into such a state of anxiety, and that it was only for this reason that he sent Titus hither, but that because Timothy was associated with him in writing the second Epistle, he could not mention the accounts received through him. The whole idea of co-authorship in the epistle on the part of Timothy is however incorrect (§ 16, 4, note 2), nor in any case would it have prevented Paul giving the accounts received through him respecting the impression produced by his letter, as the cause of his uneasiness, while it was evidently the same feeling of uneasiness that tormented him in Troas and had even tormented him when writing the letter (ii. 4). Wieseler tried vainly to find the news brought by Timothy, in the first and earlier-written half of the epistle (comp. § 21, 4, note 1). But that

Timothy did not come to Corinth; moreover the Acts know only of his journey into Macedonia (xix. 22); and Paul could not possibly have refrained from mentioning Timothy in 2 Cor. xii. 18, if he had been there. It is however certain that accidental delay was not the cause of his absence. It evidently became clear to the Apostle soon after his letter had gone, in which moreover he had already spoken of the coming of Timothy as hypothetical (1 Cor. xvi. 10: ἐὰν ἔλθῃ), that after having himself written to Corinth respecting party division, on the basis of more recent information, the directions given to Timothy under other supposed circumstances could not attain their object. For this reason he had called him back from Macedonia and in his stead had sent Titus to Corinth with new instructions, but mainly that he might bring him tidings as to the impression made by his letter and its result. Titus was to meet him on the journey he himself intended to make through Macedonia, whence it happened that he already expected him in Troas, and actually met him in Macedonia (2 Cor. vii. 5 f.).

The whole state of affairs assumes a different aspect, if we suppose that a letter of the Apostle's between our two Epistles was lost, as Bleek (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1830, 3, comp. on the other hand Müller, *ibid.*, and Wurm, *Tüb. Theol. Zeitschr.*, 1838, 1) maintained, in which view he was soon followed by Credner, Neander, Reuss and others. In this case Timothy must indeed have gone to Corinth, but have met with an unfavourable reception there, while the fornicator, boldly defiant, must have resisted the commands of the Apostle. Ewald, Weizsäcker and Mangold, who hold that the Apostle made another journey thither in the interval (comp. § 19, 1, note 1), as well as Hilgenfeld even maintain, on the basis of vii. 12, that gross insult was offered to the Apostle, or, as Beyschlag conceives (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1865, 2) to his ambassador; an

Timothy had already set out before the first letter arrived and could therefore bring no news, as Hofmann asserts, is just as inconceivable as that he only arrived there after Titus, who had been sent subsequently, and perhaps brought later news than he, since there is no mention of such news. Nor can it be held that Titus was sent to Corinth before our first Epistle, possibly with the lost letter, as Schrader, J. F. Müller (*de Tribus Pl. Itin.*, Basel, 1831) and others have tried to show.

application of the hypothesis which, however, its latest advocate (Klöpper, *Untersuchungen*, etc., Gött., 1869: *Kommentar*, Berl., 1874) decidedly rejects. On account of these sorrowful tidings, Paul is then said to have sent Titus with a far sharper letter to Corinth, which Hausrath (*der Vierkapitelbrief des Paulus an die Corinthen*, Heidelberg, 1870) thought he had found in Chap. x. 13 of our Epistle, and Hagge (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1876, 3) tried to complete by some sections of our first Epistle. Thus 2 Cor. ii. 1-4 is made to refer to this lost letter, ii. 5-11 (comp. vii. 12) to what happened during Timothy's stay, and vii. 5-11 to the accounts brought by Titus respecting the result of the former sharp letter. The only thing apparently in favour of this view is the way in which Paul describes the mood in which he wrote this letter (ii. 4) and his anxiety as to the result (ii. 13; vii. 5).² But whatever interpretation be put upon the words of this keenly sensitive man, such hypothesis is hopelessly shattered by the fact that our second Epistle explains why Paul first went to Corinth, instead of travelling past Corinth to Macedonia (i. 15 f., 23; comp. ii. 12, 14) although the first Epistle had already announced this to be his intention (xvi. 5 f.).³ If Titus had gone to Corinth in the interval with a new letter, not only would the Church have learnt from him why Paul had not come, but the epistle which according to ii. 1-4 he wrote instead of going himself, can only have been our first one in which he tells them that he would come to Corinth by Macedonia. But in this case ii. 5-11 can only refer to a matter treated of in this epistle (comp. v. 9) and hence only to the

² On the other hand there is no foundation for the statement that our Epistle gives no occasion for accusing Paul of self-commendation and boasting, since passages such as iv. 3 f., 11 f., ix. 1 ff., xiv. 18, xv. 10 and the repeated appeals to his own example in iv. 16 f., ix. 15-23, 26 f., x. 33, xi. 1, gave ample occasion for such a charge, and 2 Cor. i. 12 seems to point directly to 1 Cor. ii. 4 f. But apart from the doctrinal discussions of the long epistle so calmly argued out, to which the above naturally does not refer, we cannot overlook the profound excitement, the cutting severity and even bitterness with which all the polemical parts of the epistle are written (vi. 5 ff., xi. 17, 22, xiv. 36 ff., xv. 34), in particular iii. 1-4, iv. 6-13 and v. 1 ff., to which from its connection with 2 Cor. ii. 5 ff., Paul evidently makes special reference. Nor must it be forgotten that the cold objectivity with which he treats of so many things, makes us feel the absence of that tone of fatherly love that the Church would probably expect and that he too would no doubt rather have employed.

³ To make the change of the plan of his journey consist only in the circumstance that, instead of going from Corinth straight to Macedonia, he returned to Ephesus, as Mangold does, is quite impossible, since this would have been a matter of perfect indifference to the Corinthians.

subject of the fornicator as represented in the first Epistle, to which the expression chosen (v. 6 f. : τῆ τοιοῦτω, comp. 1 Cor. v. 5) likewise points, as even Klöpffer, the ablest representative of the hypothesis, must concede. But since chap. vii. follows up the renewed exhortation not to defile themselves by participation in heathen doings (vi. 14-18), the accounts of Titus mentioned in this connection can only refer to the partial improvement that had already taken place, viz. to the success of the first Epistle, in which they were so earnestly warned against heathen sins, and therefore vii. 12 must refer only to the particular case mentioned in it, and not to a recent personal offence, to which nothing in the context leads. We must therefore continue to hold, that Titus, who at his second sending to Corinth was also to carry on the work of collecting (viii. 6), which certainly does not point to increased strain as the result of an entirely new episode, first brought tidings as to the success of the first Epistle and the circumstances to which it had given rise in Corinth, a view rightly adhered to by the latest expositors of the Epistle (Hofmann, Heinrici). The conjecture that he took with him an epistle to the Church, as Bleek and Hofmann maintain, is quite untenable. On the controversies respecting the relation between the two epistles comp. also Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1879.

§ 21. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

1. The news brought by Titus sounded not unfavourably from one point of view; the Apostle felt that God had once more triumphed over him, putting all his cares to shame (2 Cor. ii. 14; comp. vii. 5 f.). He no longer regretted having troubled the Church by his letter; for it had led to earnest self-examination and the manifestation of active zeal for repentance and amendment (vii. 7-11). Even the fornicator, on whom the Church, at least by a majority, had pronounced the required excommunication, had earnestly repented, so that Paul could now unhesitatingly assent to the wish of the Church that he should be pardoned (ii. 5-11; comp. vii. 12). Personally Titus had met with the most favourable reception (vii. 13 f.). Such deeply rooted evils as were to be found in the Corinthian Church could not indeed be done away at one stroke; Paul fears on his arrival, by no means close at hand, to find rem-

nants of the old party strifes (xii. 20), he continually warns them against close intercourse with their heathen countrymen and the inevitable contamination they would thus incur (vi. 14-vii. 1), he fears he may still find old sinners who have not repented and who may call forth his apostolic punitive authority (xii. 21-xiii. 3). Nor was he by any means certain what progress the work of collecting had made, as may be seen from the increasing urgency of his recommendations. Its success in his dear Macedonian Churches had been so unexpectedly brilliant (viii. 1-5), that the Corinthian Church may possibly have found it no easy task to vie with them and to satisfy the rising demands of the Apostle. It is certain that he again sent Titus before him, with two other brethren (viii. 16-34), that when he should arrive with the Macedonians who were to accompany him, he might find the money ready to be delivered (ix. 3-5). But in the Church as a whole he had recovered confidence (vii. 16).

2. One thing only gave the Apostle great uneasiness, viz. the action of the Jewish-Christian agitators in Corinth. They had not yet indeed come forward openly with their legal doctrine, as Klöpffer still maintains; but Paul knew them well (ii. 17) and had not a moment's doubt as to the final aim of their machinations. If their object was to undermine the authority of the Apostle, to throw suspicion on his person and to set up their own authority in place of his, they only succeeded in preparing the ground in which at some future time they might successfully sow their seed; and in proportion as the struggle for the cause had taken a personal character, had animosity to the person of the Apostle increased to an unexpected degree. Nor had his first Epistle by any means a favourable influence in this respect. His readers had been obliged to assent to the justice of what he said, they had been roused to salutary fear, but he had not gained their love by his letter; a per-

ceptible coolness towards him had ensued (vi. 11 ff.; comp. xii. 15). His opponents had taken advantage of the impression made by the letter to alienate the hearts of the readers still further from him, and succeeded in turning all its contents to their own profit, as against the Apostle, in the most artful way. They described its severity as unfeeling and wounding arrogance, his indulgence towards them on his previous visit as personal cowardice (x. 1, 10), and his holy zeal as eccentricity (v. 13); his repeated references to his own conduct were represented as vain boasting, an attempt to recommend himself since he had no one else to recommend him (iii. 1; v. 12); while the change in the plan of his journey was adduced as a proof of insincerity and fickleness in his promises (i. 12, 17). But they had gone further. They had reproached him with want of eloquence (xi. 6), and obscurity in his manner of teaching (iv. 3), pointing to the opposition he so frequently encountered, to his persecutions and even his bodily weakness as signs of his having been forsaken by God (iv. 7 ff., vi. 4 ff., xii. 7 ff.). The fact that he did not allow the Church to support him, they construed as a want of love and a slight to this Church as compared with others (xi. 9-xii. 15); even hinting, perhaps with malicious slander respecting his zeal in the matter of collections (comp. viii. 20), that he probably knew how to draw profit from them in other ways (xii. 16 ff.).¹ It was necessary to put an end to these proceedings if the imminent

¹ We find no trace in this epistle of his claim to be an apostle having been contested, certainly not in comparison with the primitive apostles; it was not for the Jerusalem apostles as such, but for their persons, that his opponents claimed the authority of which they robbed him. In every case, even in xii. 11 f., he compares himself with the disciples of Christ who were active in Corinth, and finds it necessary to set forth his sincerity and joyful self-sacrifice in his work, his gifts and his successes, as signs of the Divine calling and blessing, as contrasted with their conduct, for they imposed upon the Church by their immoderate boasting (x. 12 ff.) and the boldness of their demands (xi. 19 ff.) and thus only too visibly gained ground from day to day.

danger of seduction like that of the Galatian Churches was to be obviated and the moral regeneration of the Church that had begun was to be completed, for which purpose it was requisite that his shaken authority should be fully re-established. To this end Paul wrote the second Epistle to the Corinthians. The calumnies of his opponents had wounded him deeply, especially as they touched points where his best intentions had been twisted by them into the very opposite. He wrote under great excitement, the throbs of which are felt throughout the epistle; there is no lack of bitter irony or of sharp words, nor yet of the full consciousness of his glorious calling and the free gush of inspiration in imparting what he had to say to the Church. Hence a certain inequality in the tone of the epistle, no other showing such diversities of style within itself, or so much that is peculiar as compared with all the rest. The development of thought is not always so systematic as elsewhere, it is capricious and the Apostle repeats himself; but the design of this magnificent apology is sufficiently clear and transparent.

3. The epistle addresses itself at the beginning not merely to the Corinthian Church, but to all the Christians of Achaia, since Paul could not be sure that the Judaists who had lost ground in the metropolis, were not seeking to regain it in the province, there to begin their machinations afresh (2 Cor. i. 1 f.). He commences as usual with a thanksgiving, not for what God had done for the Church, but for the comfort he had experienced when God delivered him from his heavy affliction in Asia Minor (i. 3-11). His defence of himself then begins forthwith, but it is directed in the first instance to a point immediately connected with his last epistle, inasmuch as he writes instead of coming to them as he had formerly promised to do. He had given them this promise (by letter) in the firm confidence that it would be understood as expressing his earnest wish to serve

them as much as possible, not foreseeing that between the lines they would read certain reservations permitting him easily to change his resolves (i. 12-22). The true reason why he had not come to them, was simply that he could not appear at Corinth with words of censure, and therefore preferred to write, notwithstanding the difficulty he found in so doing, for he knew that his letter would trouble them, however little such might be his intention (i. 23-ii. 4). Only in proof of this does he here mention the matter of the fornicator, in which his severity had evidently wounded them, and shows by his readiness to pardon the repentant sinner at the wish of the Church, how unwilling he is to distress them by arbitrary persistence (ii. 5-11).¹ But when he goes on to tell of the uneasiness that drove him from Troas to Macedonia, because of his not finding Titus, who was to bring him tidings from Corinth (ii. 12 f.), it is fully shown that deep anxiety alone had prompted him to write to the Corinthians. Finally he thanks God for having freed him from this anxiety, which could only have been done by His giving the desired efficacy to His word in their hearts (ii. 14 ff.), and thus concludes the introductory thanksgiving, as he is accustomed to begin it, with a glance at what God had done for the Church. He not only connects it with the first Epistle, and while defending himself on account of the change in his plan of journey, shows clearly

¹ The supposition that Paul, not being able to carry out his sentence of punishment, prudently gave this turn to the matter in order to avoid an open breach with the Church, and to preserve his authority at least in form, put forward by Baur and some other expositors, is quite at variance with the text. The fact that he himself urges them by a formal decree to reinstate in the love of the brethren one who had so deeply fallen (ii. 8), proves that he had actually been shut out from the Church, *i.e.* excommunicated (ii. 6), as Paul had desired (1 Cor. v. 13), since he speaks of delivering him over to Satan only as the punishment he desired in the first instance, and only to be carried out in agreement with the whole Church (v. 3 ff.). The removal of the ban of excommunication had not yet been fully effected, but was only desired by the Church.

the object with which he had written it, but gives the Corinthians a glance into the external and internal struggles he had since experienced. The mention of the power God had given to his word, naturally leads him to the thought that this was only possible because he had preached the word of God conscientiously, in a pure and unadulterated form (ii. 17).

4. Thus his self-defence is actually begun in lofty style. He will not defend himself against any particular accusation, but by a description of the nature of his office and the way in which he fulfils its duties, would prove that he is what he claims to be. He requires no letters of commendation like his opponents; for the Corinthian Church which he founded, is itself his letter of recommendation. Not by his own power did he found it however, but by virtue of the ability bestowed upon him for the service of a new covenant, the service of the Spirit (iii. 1-6). The glory of this service consists in the fact that it does not bring condemnation and death on man like the service of the law (which nevertheless had a glory of its own), but justification and life; that it is not a transitory but a permanent thing (iii. 6-11). Hence the unreserved openness and freedom of speech with which he carries out his ministry, while Moses, as the Apostle concludes from an allegorical interpretation of the narrative of the veiling of Moses, was obliged to conceal the transitory character of his office from the children of Israel, for which reason it is still undiscernible by the (hardened) Jews, until by conversion to Christ they are changed with all believers into His spiritual glory, with which freedom from the law is given. In such service he could never be faint-hearted, since it is by the pure and unadulterated revelation of the truth that he commends himself to every man's conscience; and his gospel is unintelligible only to those who are blinded by the Devil, while God Himself permits the light of His glory to be seen in the exalted Christ whom he preaches (iv.

1-6).¹ Even the sorrows that his ministry brings with it have no power to discourage him, for through the help that he experiences they only redound afresh to the glory of his service (iv. 7-15) and open up a glance into an eternal glory which the true servant of Christ cannot fail to attain, whether his wish to receive a heavenly body without dying be fulfilled or not (iv. 16-v. 10). His declaration at the close of this first section, that in view of the judgment of Christ, his sole endeavour is to please Him, leads him on to speak of the way in which he fulfils the duties of his office as a servant of God and of the Church. This again is not intended as self-commendation, but only as a means of enabling them to defend him against his adversaries; and he is at liberty to boast of his ministration, because this is not his own work, but the result of the new creation that he experienced after being reconciled with God through the proof of Christ's love given in His death (v. 11-19). And now breaks forth with unrestrained fulness the glorious description of his official life, in which he offers this reconciliation to all that have not yet received it, exhorting those that have received it not to do so in vain (v. 20-vi. 10).²

¹ While Paul unfolds the glory of his ministry by comparing it with the ministry of the law, he shows indirectly that it is not he but those who set up the law again, that corrupt the gospel (iv. 2; comp. ii. 17); and that by representing his gospel as unintelligible, they only put themselves on a par with the hardened unbelievers from whom the nature of the law is also concealed (ii. 3; comp. iii. 14).

² It is naturally by express design that in this second section of his apology Paul points out how the reconciliation through Christ's death proclaimed in the gospel creates of itself a new life, and therefore supercedes the teaching of the law, just as the service of the spirit excludes that of the letter of the law. But it is quite an error to interpret v. 16 as a polemic against the Judaistic conception of the person of Christ, or as referring to a personal relation towards Him, for all that it contains is a declaration on the part of Paul that just as he no longer recognises Jesus Himself as he had known Him in His earthly human form, so he judges no man not even himself according to his earthly human nature, but according to what he is in Christ and has become through Him. So

5. With a deeply affecting appeal to their responsive love which he has a right to expect and yet fails to obtain from them (vi. 11-13), the Apostle turns from the apologetic to the hortatory part of his epistle, in which he again warns them in the most earnest way against all participation in heathen doings (vi. 14-vii. 1). But desiring that there be no fresh misunderstanding, as though he would oppress them by unjust condemnation and unreasonable demands, he now for the first time comes to speak in detail of the good accounts brought by Titus that had given him new and joyful confidence in them (vii. 2-16).¹ In this part he dwells mainly on the subject of the collections. He extols the magnificent liberality shown by the Macedonian Churches (viii. 1-6), and urgently exhorts them to bring the work that had been so willingly begun to a corresponding conclusion (viii. 7-15). He therefore once more sends Titus to them (with this epistle) accompanied by two brethren deputed by their Churches to convey the offering of love, admonishing them to see to it that if he himself came with the Macedonian brethren, the Corinthians should not put him to shame before those to whom he had boasted of their willingness (viii. 16-ix. 5). He then urges them once more to make the collection very liberal, referring par-

too the side-glance he takes at the eccentric fanaticism he was accused of (v. 13), which naturally has nothing whatever to do with the vision he had received of Christ or his claim to apostleship founded thereon, is just as incidental as his reference to the unintelligible character of his gospel (iv. 3), since here he purposely avoids all detailed polemic against the Judaists.

¹ Hence it is clear that the assertion that vi. 14-vii. 1 breaks the connection is quite incorrect. This clause has either been directly regarded as un-Pauline, as by Schrader and Holsten, or as an interpolation from another epistle, as by Ewald, in particular from the first Epistle to the Corinthians which was lost, as by Hilgenfeld and Franke (comp. § 19, 1, note 2). So too Wieseler's view that the second half of the epistle, from vii. 2 onward, was written later than the first half, after the arrival of Titus (§ 20, 7, note 1), is wrecked by ii. 14, in which the Apostle had certainly received already better tidings.

ticularly to the impression it would make on the recipients (ix. 6-15).³

6. The third part begins in a tone altogether different. For his own part he is willing to admonish them in meekness and gentleness; but those who construe this as weakness, and accuse him of walking according to the flesh, oblige him to prove that he can wield other weapons also (x. 1-6). These are the disciples of Christ in opposition to whom he might well boast of his apostolic authority, if he did not wish to expose himself to the reproach of being bold only in words (x. 7-10). In direct contrast with them he refrained from seeking by immoderate boasting to thrust himself into a sphere of work that did not concern him, and boasts only of the success the Lord had actually accorded him, by which He commends himself (x. 11-18). It is only from holy zeal, to protect the Church against the seduction to which she yielded too readily, that he would commit the folly, and compare himself with these very chiefest apostles, to whom he is perhaps inferior in readiness of speech, but certainly not in knowledge (xi. 1-6). But first they should tell him how he had committed an offence against them since he had preached the gospel to them without recompense (xi. 7-11); and this he would continue to do, that he might see whether his opponents would try to excel him in disinterestedness; for their former conduct showed them to be only false apostles and servants of Satan (xi. 12-15). In a new and ironical apology for the folly of such self-praise,

³ Attention has already been called to the difficulty of conceiving that Paul should have worked so zealously for the collection and have spoken so confidently of its impression on the recipients, while carrying on at the same time such bitter strife with the legitimate deputies of the primitive Church and its authorities, mainly perhaps with the latter. Since Semler's Paraphrase of 1776, it has sometimes been doubted whether chaps viii. and ix., in which there is so much repetition, chap. ix. seeming to form a fresh beginning, were originally connected; but the section viii. 16-24 has no reference whatever to the matter in question, if ix. 1-5 does not belong to it.

all his bitterness of feeling with regard to the way in which the Church had allowed itself to be imposed on and plundered by them, now breaks forth (xi. 16-21); and again contrasting himself with them, he counts up the endless series of persecutions, perils, afflictions and privations he had suffered in the service of the Lord (xi. 22-33). He might speak also of the exalted experiences of grace with which he had been favoured; but he prefers to boast of his sicknesses and infirmities because by them the power of Christ is most gloriously manifested in him (xii. 1-10). Again pointing out that they themselves had driven him to the folly of such comparison with the very chiefest apostles, he comes back once more to the subject of his disinterestedness so basely slandered, which he will not give up, and which his messengers manifested as well as himself (xii. 11-18). It is only the apologetic form that makes this section in truth the sharpest polemic against the disturbers of his Church.¹ After thus annihilating his adversaries who interfere with his full influence on the Church, he turns with an earnest warning to those who are still impenitent, and threatens at his coming to make them feel his full apostolic power to punish; although he prays God that by leading them to repentance He may take from him all occasion to prove that he is not deficient in power to carry out his threat (xii. 19-xiii. 10). He concludes with a comprehensive exhortation, greetings and the benediction (xiii. 11-13).

7. When Paul wrote this epistle he was staying at Macedonia (vii. 5) in company with Timothy (i. 1), though

¹ This so fully explains the suddenly altered tone, the anger and bitterness of the polemic, that there was no motive for separating chaps. x.-xiii. from the remainder of the epistle, as Weber in particular does (*de Numero Epp. P. ad Cor.*, Witeb., 1798), after the example of Semler; or even for supposing them to be the alleged lost epistle between our 1st and 2nd (§ 20, 7), as Klöpffer, Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, and Heinrici have tried to prove in opposition to him.

Philippi is found in the old subscriptions, without apparent reason. On the other hand the current date of the epistle is very uncertain.¹ It is extremely improbable that Titus, who was unquestionably sent to Corinth soon after the despatch of our first Epistle, only reached the Apostle late in the autumn. It is much more probable that the epistle was sent off in midsummer of the year in the spring of which the first was written. That it fully answered its purpose like the Galatian Epistle we may regard as certain, since we have no knowledge of any further correspondence with the Corinthians on the part of Paul; and he would hardly have gone to Corinth without having received tidings of the success of this epistle. There was still sufficient time for him to extend his ministry as far as Illyria, which he already had in view (2 Cor. x. 15 f.), and of which he makes express mention in Rom. xv. 19. It is certain that he finally came to Corinth with Timothy (Rom. xvi. 21), and there spent the three winter months, as in 1 Cor. xvi. 6 he proposed to do. There is no indication in the Epistle to the Romans of his having first brought the contest with his

¹ Though Paul repeatedly speaks of the time when the Achaian Churches declared their readiness to make a collection themselves for Jerusalem as the previous year (*ἀπὸ πέρους*: viii. 10; ix. 2), yet we do not know what time this itself was. We only know that when Paul in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 f., touched on more definite arrangements as to the mode of gathering the money, the Church must already have declared itself agreed as to the principle of making the collection. But whether expression was first given to this in the Church-letter brought by Stephanas, or at an earlier date (perhaps at his second visit), we do not know. Nor is the point where Paul begins the year up to which the former year extended, any more certain; whether he begins it with the month Nisan, in accordance with the religious observances of the Jews, as Hofmann supposes; or in accordance with the later civil custom, with the month Tisri, as Meyer, Klöpper and others hold; or after the Macedonian custom, from the autumnal equinox, as Wieseler maintains (as though Paul in ix. 2 intended to repeat the letter of the words he had spoken to the Macedonians); or, as appears the only natural thing in a letter to the Corinthians, from the summer solstice, in accordance with Attic-Olympic usage, as Credner believed.

Judaistic adversaries to an end in that place; no doubt the latter had abandoned the field after the discomfiture our second Corinthian Epistle had inflicted on them. He dwelt with Gaius, whose house seems to have formed the centre of Corinthian Church-life; and was on the best terms with Erastus the chamberlain of the city, and Quartus, who doubtless belonged to the heads of the Church (Rom. xvi. 23). In the coming spring he would take ship for the East, in order with the deputies to carry to the Church at Jerusalem the liberal collection he had in view (1 Cor. xvi. 3 f.), before taking final leave of his Oriental sphere of work (Rom. xv. 25-28).

§ 22. THE CHURCH AT ROME.

1. Towards the end of his stay at Ephesus Paul had conceived the plan of visiting Rome on his return from the collection-journey to Jerusalem (Acts xix. 21); it even seems as if he had previously entertained this wish, and had only been prevented from carrying it out by the more pressing problems of his ministry in the East (Rom. i. 13). There can be no question that the importance the Church of the world's metropolis must eventually have for the development of Christianity, and which everywhere forced itself on Christian consciousness (i. 8), was clear to him from the beginning; for which reason it was natural he should wish to enter into personal relation with it and acquire an influence over it (i. 11; xv. 29). At length nothing seemed to stand in the way of the fulfilment of such wish. Paul might regard his ministry in his former missionary sphere as closed. From Jerusalem to Illyria he had preached the gospel (xv. 19), and Churches had been founded by him at every focus of spiritual life, whence Christianity might easily spread of itself. Esteeming it his special task to lay the first foundation in all places, he might naturally

think there was no further scope for his peculiar work in the East; and so direct his glance to the far West, where, in Spain, he would again begin his missionary labour on new soil (xv. 20-24). In addition to this, he might hope that by his victories in Galatia and Corinth he had given his Judaistic adversaries a permanent distaste for attempting to trouble his Gentile-Christian Churches; and might therefore leave the work of his former mission in perfect security. Moreover he was on the point of forming a bond of love between the free Gentile Churches and the primitive Church that still adhered to the law, by the large collection he was bringing to Jerusalem, which, if favourably received (xv. 31), might prevent a breach, in case Jewish-Christian fanatics should perchance try to stir up the latter against the former (xv. 25 ff.). On his journey to Spain however, it would be quite natural that he should pass through Rome, and there endeavour to satisfy his long-cherished wish (xv. 24, 28, 32). It is this visit that Paul now announces to the Church at Rome in his epistle; hence it was written immediately before he set out on the journey to Jerusalem (xv. 25).

In accordance with the above the historical position of the Epistle to the Romans is so perfectly clear that Dr. Paulus, who concludes from xv. 19 that it was written in a town of Illyria, alone mistakes it (*de Orig. Ep. Pauli ad Rom*, Jena, 1801). The only doubtful point is whether it was written in Corinth, as is generally supposed, or in the port of Cenchrea, in which case the deaconess of the latter place was probably its bearer (xvi. 1), while Paul waited there for an opportunity of taking ship to the East, and had therefore actually begun his journey (xv. 25). The fears to which he gives expression in xv. 30 f., are a strong argument, however, in favour of the assumption that he already had intelligence of the plots that led him afterwards to give up the direct sea-route to Syria and to take the land-route through Macedonia (Acts xx. 3); while the greetings that he sends from Corinth (Rom. xvi. 21-23) might have been given to him in that place, if we suppose that these brethren did not accompany him as far as the harbour. The fact that there are so few greetings, and that the Church as such sends none, is strongly in favour of this view. In any case the epistle was written

soon after the beginning of the sea-voyage; and if the Corinthian Epistles belong to the year 58 (§ 20, 1, note 2), in the spring of 59.

2. Respecting the origin of the Church at Rome we have no certain knowledge. We know only that there was a large Jewish population at Rome, especially after the time of Pompey, that had reached a state of freedom and prosperity and stood in close relation with the whole Jewish Diaspora as well as with their Palestinian home. In both there were communities of believing Jews, and it would have been strange if the burning question whether the Messiah had come or not, had not found its way into the bosom of the Jewish body at Rome. Whether this be accounted for by the presence of Roman pilgrims at the first Christian Pentecost (Acts ii. 10), or by the dispersion that followed the first persecution of the Christians (viii. 1; xi. 19), is quite a matter of indifference; the ways that led Roman Jews to Jerusalem or to other places where there were Jewish-Christian Churches, and believing Jews to Rome, are too many to permit of their being taken into special consideration. The idea that a Church of believers could not originate without actual apostolic agency is quite unhistorical.

It was not till the end of the second century that currency was given to that view of the Apostolic Churches (comp. § 8, 2) which ascribed the actual founding of the Church at Rome to Peter and Paul, and finally to Peter alone, who was said to have come to Rome as early as the second year of the Emperor Claudius (A.D. 42) and to have been bishop there for a period of 25 years (comp. Hieron., *de Vir. Ill.*, 1, after *Euseb. Chronik.*, and more specific details in § 39, 4). But it can be proved that Peter was still at Jerusalem in the year 44 (Acts xii. 4) and 52 (Acts xv. 7; Gal. ii. 9), while the Epistle to the Romans knows nothing of his presence at Rome, since he receives neither mention nor greeting, nor is he referred to in the Acts (xxviii. 15) or in the Epistle to the Philippians of the year 60. In Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, III. 3, 3, and Eusebius himself (*H. E.*, 3, 2, 4), Linus appears rather to have been the first Roman bishop, who according to the Apostolic Constitutions (VII. 46, 1) was even appointed by Paul himself. Hence this tradition of the Catholic Church, that has been

defended even by Protestants, as Bertholdt and Thiersch, has been given up by unprejudiced Catholic theologians like Hug and Feilmoser; and the most that can be said is that the oldest Roman Church was indirectly a Petrine foundation, inasmuch as the Jewish Christians of that place always go back in some direct or indirect way to Jerusalem, and to Peter as the head of the Church.

The first historical trace of Christianity in Rome is to be found in the narrative of Suetonius, according to which the Emperor Claudius *Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit* (*Claud.* 25, comp. Acts xviii. 2 and with it. § 15, 6).¹ Even if the Claudian edict were only carried out imperfectly or soon again recalled (comp. Dio Cassius, *Hist.*, 60, 6), this crisis must have been of decisive importance for the Christian Church at Rome; for when by degrees its members re-assembled, they had every inducement to separate entirely from the synagogue lest they should again be involved in its fortunes.² But the grand missionary work of Paul in Macedonia, Greece and Asia Minor came after this edict. Many who had emigrated

¹ The assumption that reference is here made to a Jewish agitator of the name of Chrestus, still adopted by Wieseler, Meyer, Hofmann and others, cannot be entertained. It is much more probable that it is to the continual disturbances within the Jewish body excited by the dispute regarding the so-called Christ (or, according to the popular Roman pronunciation, Chrestus) that Suetonius refers as the cause of the final expulsion of the Jews. It is evident that the believing Jews were affected by this measure as well as the unbelieving, the native Jews as well as the proselytes, since the latter certainly took just as much part in religious quarrels; and their Roman-citizenship was the less adequate to their protection, Beyschlag thinks, because many native Jews also had this privilege after the time of Augustus.

² We find a reminiscence of this still preserved in the account of Acts xxviii. 22, according to which, when Paul arrives at Rome as a prisoner and desires to come to an understanding with the chief of the Jews, these latter make no allusion to the Christian Church at Rome, showing a very superficial acquaintance with the sect generally. Though we cannot explain this, with Neander, from the fact that Rome was a large city, or ascribe it to intentional reserve, yet it is arbitrary to assume that the statement naturally formulated by the author is an invention without any historical foundation.

thither must have been converted by Paul and have returned as Pauline Christians; while many of the heathen who had been converted by Paul must have come to Rome and have joined themselves to the Christian Church that held aloof from the synagogue. Here, where the national religion had long fallen into contempt, and the tendency to monotheism was widely spread, their free Christianity must have made a successful propaganda; the Gentile-Christian element preponderating more and more in the Church although it certainly contained a not inconsiderable number of believing Jews.³ Moreover it is not consistent with Paul's principles (comp. 2 Cor. x. 13 ff.; Rom. xv. 20) that he should have turned with an epistle like ours to a Church which, as then constituted, did not consist substantially of his immediate or proximate disciples.

3. In the Epistle to the Romans too the Church appears as essentially Gentile-Christian. Paul makes the ἀποστολή ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (ἐν οἷς ἔστε καὶ ὑμεῖς κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) bestowed on him his reason for turning to believers in Rome (i. 5 ff.). He desires to have fruit among them also even as among other ἔθνη. Because he feels himself a debtor to Greeks and barbarians, wise and unwise, he is ready καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι; for he is not ashamed of the Gospel (i. 12-16).¹ In his argument Paul sets out from pre-

³ There is no reason for regarding the Church as exclusively, though indirectly, a Pauline foundation, whether by the instrumentality of Titus (comp. Kneucker, *Die Anfänge des römischen Christenthums*: Karlsruhe, 1881) or by that of Gentile Christians from Antioch as Godet maintains in his Commentary, nor is it necessary entirely to deny its Jewish-Christian origin. Respecting its organization, we learn nothing whatever from Rom. xii. 8; but we are not justified in concluding that it had no organization whatever, either from the absence of the designation ἐκκλησία in Rom. i. 7 (comp. § 16, 4, note 2) or from the fact that it was not founded by an apostle.

¹ In vain has an attempt been made to include the Jews under τὰ ἔθνη, contrary to undoubted Pauline usage, and to claim for Paul a universal apostleship in manifest contradiction to Gal. ii. 8 f.; or, taking a geographical view of the partition-treaty with the primitive apostles, to

misses that were incontrovertible only to the consciousness of Pauline Gentile-Christians (iii. 27-30); in iv. 6 he speaks of Abraham as *πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν* in a connection in which he classes his readers with himself and the Jewish-Christians, therefore as Gentile-Christians; he characterizes their past life as a bondage to *ἀκαθαρσία* and *ἀνομία* (vi. 19). He could not possibly have appealed exclusively to his own person in support of his statement that the people of Israel as such would not be rejected (xi. 1) if he had been writing to a Church that was entirely Jewish-Christian; or have spoken of the Jews so emphatically as *his* flesh, in contrast with his readers (xi. 14). He expressly addresses them as heathen (xi. 13: *ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*), and the assumption that he refers only to the Gentile-Christian portion, which, moreover, is excluded by the form of the expression, is already refuted by the fact that the term *ἀδελφοί* (xi. 25), which undoubtedly applies to the Church as a whole, is followed by a *ὑμεῖς* that clearly points to those addressed as having formerly been heathen (xi. 28, 30). But the way in which the exhortation to the majority of the Church to bear the infirmities of the weak (xv. 1 ff.), supported by a glance at the relation of Jews and Gentiles to salvation (xv. 8 f.), shows beyond a doubt that it consisted mainly of Gentiles. Finally he once more justifies himself for writing to them by an appeal to his apostleship to the Gentiles (xv. 15 f.).² Moreover, all that we know of the later history of the

explain the address by assuming that he wrote to them because they lived in the great world, and to interpret i. 13 as implying that he wished to carry on the Gentile mission in their midst, whereas i. 16 expressly speaks of a gospel addressed to themselves of which he is not ashamed, although they belong to the educated.

² Mangold has with great ingenuity endeavoured to set aside this decisive passage by finding in it only an excuse for certain passages of the epistle in which Paul had energetically combated Jewish-Christian pretensions also shared by his readers, in the *interest* of the Gentile-Christian mission with which he had been entrusted, such as chaps. ii., ix., x., making xv. 1 ff. refer to the opposition between a Jewish-

Roman Church agrees with this. The fact that the persecution under Nero was directed against the Christians as such, in distinction from the Jews who were at first favoured by Nero, is an argument not only for the separation of the (Jewish-Christian) Church from the synagogue, but also for the essentially Gentile-Christian character of the Church; and Paul's two years' sojourn in Rome as a captive could not possibly have caused the centre of gravity in the Church to be completely transferred from the Jewish to the Gentile-Christian side. The so-called first Epistle of Clement also shows that the Roman Church of that time was essentially of a Pauline Gentile-Christian character. Nor can Mangold's further conclusions respecting the history of the Church in the second century, even if better attested than is the case, prove anything with regard to the Pauline time, since the fact that Gentile Christianity had then gained the upper hand is not disputed.

It is only since Baur (following Koppe's *Nov. Test.*, 3rd edit., Gött., 1824) in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift* (1836, 3), owing to his conception of the aim and occasion of the Epistle to the Romans, declared the Church to have been essentially Jewish-Christian, that the question of its character has taken the form of scientific controversy. He was immediately followed not only by his actual pupils as Schwegler, Volkmar, Holsten, and Hilgenfeld, but also by commentators such as Krehl, Baumgarten-Crusius, v. Stengel, and critics as Reuss, Hausrath, Krenkel, Renan, Lipsius (in the *Protestantenbibel*), Mangold (*der Römerbrief*, Marb., 1866), Seyerlen (*Entst. u. erste Schicksale der Christengem. in Rom*, Tüb., 1874), Schenkel (*Bibellex*, V., 1875), even Thiersch and Sabatier. He encountered opposition, it is true (comp. Kling in *d. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1837, 2; Delitzsch and Riggenbach in *d. Zeitschr. für luth. Theol.*, 1849, 4: 1868, 1; Th. Schott, *der Römerbrief*, Erl., 1858), while most commentators adhered to the customary view. Beyschlag attempted a mediating hypothesis, making the Church consist entirely of proselytes (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1864, 4; comp. also W. Schultz, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1876, 1); but in the *Jahrb. für protest. Theol.* of 1876, 2, Holtzmann asserted with some plausibility that the older view had been superseded by more recent

Christian majority and minority, and thus doing away with all motive for mentioning the Jews and Gentiles in xv. 8 f.

investigation. Since then a retrograde movement has set in, mainly through the instrumentality of Weizsäcker (*Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1876, 2). Not only has the essentially Gentile-Christian character of the Church been recognised by Wieseler (*zur Gesch. der NTlichen Schrift*, Leipz., 1880), Weiss (6th edition of Meyer's *Komm.*, 1881), Grafe (*über Veranlassung und Zweck des Römerbriefs*, Tüb., 1881), Pfeiderer (*Jahrb. für protest. Theol.*, 1882, 4) and Bleibtreu, *die 3 ersten Kapp. des Römerbriefs*, Gött., 1884); but Schürer, Harnack and others have also incidentally expressed themselves in favour of this view; even Holtzmann (*Jahrb. für protest. Theol.*, 1886, 1) no longer making very decided opposition; while Mangold (*der Römerbrief und seine geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen*, Marb., 1884) makes a fresh attempt to defend the Tübingen view, in which the school of Hofmann seems now to participate (K. Schmidt, *die Anfänge des Christenthums in Rom.*, 1879; Th. Zahn, *d. Hebräerbrief*, in Herz's *R.-Enc.*, V., 1879). The designation of Abraham in iv. 1 as *προπάτωρ ἡμῶν*, cannot, after 1 Cor. x. 1, be adduced as an argument for the Jewish-Christian character of the Church, so that vii. 1-6 is the only passage to which Beyschlag and Mangold can appeal with any show of reason, and this they repeatedly do, but in vain.³ The assumption that the exhortations in chap. xiii. 1 ff. presuppose Jewish-Christian opposition to the Roman supremacy (although later criticism regards 1 Pet. ii. 13 ff. as addressed exclusively to Gentile Christians) overlooks the fact that the Jews might reject it in Palestine on theocratic grounds, but not on heathen soil, so that all the arguments drawn from the Roman Church prayer in Clement's Epistle (cap. 61) in favour of the continuance of a Jewish-Christian element in the Church, fall to the ground.

4. The main interest of the dispute regarding the national character of the Church at Rome consists in the fact that it

³ It was possible for Paul to speak of the Roman Gentile Christians in vii. 1 as knowing the law, even if reference were actually made there to the Mosaic law, since this was undoubtedly read at their assemblies for worship (Gal. iv. 21; comp. § 15, 2, note 2); but it is probable that a knowledge of jurisprudence is here meant, since the ordinance of which he there treats is by no means peculiar to the Mosaic law. The argument for the essential freedom of the Christian from the law has exactly the same significance for Gentile as for Jewish Christians, since the former were also under obligation to the law as soon as they turned to the God of Israel, if such obligation had any permanence at all; for which reason it is so emphatically carried out in the Galatian Epistle (§ 18, 5, note 2). The passage vii. 5 f. does not say that the readers stood with him under the law, but that they were protected by their common freedom from the law against the old sinful state which the letter of the law only fostered and enhanced and would always again call forth and enhance.

has been thought impossible, assuming the correctness of the traditional view as to its Gentile-Christian character, to find any historical motive sufficient to account for the comprehensive doctrinal discussions of the Epistle to the Romans with its apologetic and polemic allusions. The view most prevalent in Commentaries, viz. that the Apostle designed to give a statement of his doctrinal system (comp. Huther: *Zweck und Inhalt der 11 ersten Kap. des Römerbriefs*, 1846), is negatived by the fact that important points are scarcely even touched upon; and that from this point of view the section chaps. ix.-xi. would be quite unexplained. Hence Baur, following the Commentary of Ambrosiaster, sought to class our epistle with the great Pauline polemic writings against Jewish Christianity, which alone he regarded as genuine;¹ while Schwegler looked upon it as a systematic apology for Paulinism against Jewish Christianity. But even Mangold was constrained to deny the anti-Pauline character of Roman Jewish-Christianity, and to limit the aim of the epistle to a desire on Paul's part, by a statement of his doctrine of salvation and a vindication of his missionary practice, to induce the Roman Church to give up their scruples regarding his teaching and the Gentile mission; while Beyschlag, in direct opposition to Baur, found that the Church consisting of former converts, though friendly to Paul, had a Petrine tendency that only required raising to the full height of Pauline apprehension of the Gospel method and the

¹ Hence Baur found that the Roman Epistle represented a peculiar form of (Ebionite) anti-Paulinism which had abandoned the requirement of circumcision and fulfilment of the law on the part of the Gentile Christians as well as opposition to the apostleship of Paul, but perceived in his Gentile mission an abridgment of the theocratic prerogatives of Israel, and betrayed an affinity to the tendency of the Clementine Homilies in rejecting worldly authorities as well as the use of flesh and wine. If the section ix.-xi. had not hitherto received full justice—being regarded more in the light of a corollary—he saw in it the proper nucleus of the epistle, though he somewhat modified his view afterwards and endeavoured to apprehend the epistle rather as a whole.

world-historical Divine plan of salvation.² But however we may soften the antithesis of those views in the Church that were in alleged opposition to the Apostle, it is incontestable that he never directly attacks them. On the contrary, he freely joins in the universal praise of the faith of the Church, thanking God for it, and unmistakably implies that the *τύπος διδαχῆς* they had obeyed was his free doctrine (vi. 17), just as to themselves he had formerly appealed to his gospel. He most distinctly takes for granted that they know and share his doctrine (xv. 24 f.); i. 12 in particular would be a *captatio benevolentiae* if Paul regarded the Church as occupying a standpoint in any way hostile to his views, or as having not yet understood them. The truly polemic parts of the epistle cannot be explained on the presumption of a Jewish-Christian tendency. For the fact that the law avails nothing if it is not kept, nor circumcision unless followed by the fulfilment of the law (chap. ii.), that fidelity to God is not made of no effect by the unbelief of the Jews, and that the law condemns the Jews as sinners (iii. 1-20), that the gracious election of God, as shown in Isaac and Jacob, and the hardening of Pharaoh, are not unrighteous acts on the part of God, nor a breach of His promises (ix. 6-21), that the rejection of unbelieving Israel is self-incurred (ix. 30-x. 21); all these are things that no Jewish-Christian ever disputed, and that cannot be alleged against such with polemic design.³

5. As the Roman Church certainly contained a Jewish-

² These points of view could be adopted not only by Sabatier and Thiersch who regarded the Church as Jewish-Christian, but even by Riggenbach (*ibid.*), who considered it as essentially Gentile-Christian, while representing the Apostle as having respect to the scruples of the Jewish-Christian minority.

³ The patristic expositors judged more correctly that this polemic attacks Jewish pretensions which, even according to Eichhorn, Schmidt, Schott and others were directed mainly against the call of the heathen; while Bleibtreu (*ibid.*) finds the most refined anti-Jewish polemic throughout the doctrinal discussion; though he too is unable to explain what this had to do with a Gentile-Christian Church.

Christian element, it was possible to make a conciliatory tendency the historical occasion of the epistle. This had already been done by Hug and Berthold, Delitzsch and Bleek; and in the same way Hilgenfeld sought to modify Baur's conception, not only distinguishing the Roman Jewish-Christians from the fanatics of Jerusalem, but also putting a higher estimate on the Gentile-Christian section, and making the internal friction of these two parties the proper occasion of the epistle. In like manner Volkmar (*Paulus Römerbrief*, Zurich, 1875) makes the Apostle's aim, in his polemic and pacific epistle, consist in the effort to reconcile a minority that was still restricted by Judaism with his free gospel of salvation and its success in the heathen world, and by restoring peace with a small but over-zealous Pauline minority, to prevent the Church falling to pieces; but he nevertheless succeeds in pointedly combining this view with the older conception of the epistle as a calmly reasoned doctrinal system of pure Christianity sharply arranged even in its minutest details. Holstein too regards the epistle as an essentially conciliatory work in which Paul, in order to reconcile Gentile with Jewish Christianity, makes the utmost possible concession to the latter (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1879); and Pfeiderer (*ibid.*) has not only returned to the predominantly Gentile-Christian character of the Church, but even makes the Apostle, in order to persuade the Jewish-Christian minority of the truth of his gospel and to reconcile them with the fact of victorious Gentile Christianity, disclose and impress on the unruly and hard-hearted heathen above all, the practical consequences of this gospel, a view which he too finds consistent with the dogmatic exposition in chap. i.-viii. in its wider sense. But the more the controversy actually present in the Church is restricted to that treated in chap. xiv., and the more certainly this is traced back in xv. 8 f. to the opposition between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, the more completely does the theory of wider differences

between the two parties, which our epistle is alleged to settle, lack all historical support.

6. The very conception of our epistle as a purely doctrinal work included to some extent the prophylactic aim of fortifying its readers in advance against future attacks on their faith; a view to which xvi. 17-20 seems to give some support. In this case it would have been much more natural to regard the danger from Judaistic agitators threatening the Gentile Christian Church of Rome, as well as those of Corinth and Galatia, as the actual motive of the epistle. This view, which has in any case probability in its favour, although already indicated by Grau, was first strikingly set forth by Weizsäcker; while Grafe attempted to carry it out, although *τινές* are mentioned in iii. 8 just as in the earlier polemic epistles, who calumniate the Apostle by imputing to him immoral principles, obviously as alleged consequences of his doctrines.¹ But the epistle does not afford any further support to this presupposition. On the contrary all direct reference to the question raised by the Judaistic opposition as to whether this should not first be settled by the adoption of the law and of circumcision, is wanting just where we should most naturally look for it, viz. in the statement of the new way of salvation (iii. 22-30), as well as in the proof of its Old Testament prefiguration and its final aim in the completion of salvation. The section chaps. vi.-viii. might rather be understood as directed against the reproach that Paul seduced to sin by his doc-

¹ That the dialectic questions by which Paul himself seeks to carry forward his developments (vi. 1, 15; vii. 7; xi. 1, 11) contain statements that have been foisted upon him, is as impossible to prove as that others contain objections actually made against him (comp. iii. 31; iv. 1; ix. 14, 19 ff.; x. 14 ff.; x. 18 ff.), since the purely rhetorical character of countless questions of the kind, is obvious (ii. 3 f., 21 ff.; iii. 3, 5 ff., 27; iv. 3, 9 f.; vi. 2 f., 16 vii. 1; viii. 31 ff.; ix. 30, 33; xi. 2, 4, 7, 15). This makes all certain proof of the above assumption impossible; especially since the now completely isolated reference to Judaists in iii. 8 appears in a section that presents an entirely different front (No. 4).

trine of grace and outraged the Divine institution of the law; but he sets out so ingenuously, even paradoxically, with a statement apparently most offensive (v. 20 f.) respecting the law, and proceeds to develop his argument in so doctrinal a way, in accordance with a purely ideal scheme, going so far beyond his alleged point of attack in chap. viii., that the section cannot certainly be explained from this point of view. Moreover the assertion that section chaps. ix.-xi. contains a vindication of his Gentile mission against the objections and attacks of Judaists by no means holds good.² And if this view likewise prove untenable, the attempt to find the historical occasion of the doctrinal discussions of this epistle in the relations and needs of the Roman Church must be given up. But it is quite an error to suppose that all historical interpretation of the Epistle to the Romans is therefore impossible.

7. It was T. H. Schott, who first attempted to explain the epistle by the frame of mind and intentions of the Apostle at the time of its composition; but, while laying exclusive emphasis on Paul's desire to get a firm support in the Roman Church for the new phase of his missionary activity, and therefore to instruct it as to the importance and authority of the step he intended to take as well as respecting the nature and principles of his work, he committed the same mistake as Baur by making chap. ix.-xi. the proper centre of the epistle.¹ It is necessary rather to set out with the fact that

² The partial rejection of Israel here treated of appears in nowise brought about by his Gentile mission, but by the free Divine election and hardening (chap. ix.) and by the inexcusable obstinacy of Israel (chap. x.). Where Paul comes to speak in reality of the importance of his Gentile mission in bringing about the final aim of the Divine decree of salvation, his argument reaches its practical point in the repudiation of all self-exaltation of Gentile Christianity (xi. 17 24). Thus the view that ix. 1-6 and x. 1 f. were meant for a defence against the reproach of a want of love for his countrymen, loses all support.

¹ Since moreover he looked upon the readers of the epistle as Gentile Christians, he was constrained, in order to make the discussion of

the doctrinal discussions of the epistle, in proportion as they avoid all explanation founded on polemic or apologetic aims, can only be explained by the characteristic necessity of Paul's nature (comp. § 16, 5) to bring as it were the spiritual product of the last years to his own consciousness, and to fix it in a written form. These years of strife with Judaism had not only obliged him to develop his free gospel of salvation logically on all sides, making himself acquainted with its ultimate principles and results as well as its interior connection, but also to recognise the true point of opposition directed against him and to bring it within his own range of thought.² It thus became necessary for him to draw up a statement of his new doctrine of salvation, establishing it by argument on all sides, and showing its consistency with the Divine revelation of the Old Testament as well as with the historical claims of Israel to salvation. Its occasional polemic or apologetic form naturally resulted from the fact

his step intelligible to them, to proceed to the monstrous assertion that the Oriental mission of the Apostle was still essentially a Jewish mission, and that he wished to begin his proper Gentile mission in the far West. Mangold and Sabatier, Riggenbach and Beyschlag were apparently able to make the point of view indicated by him consist with their own assumptions; but the whole conception of the support that Paul desired to gain for his Spanish mission in Rome, is incomprehensible and is arbitrarily thrust into xv. 24. The way in which Hofmann attempts to explain the epistle by purely personal references to the Church is deficient in all historical sense, while his exegesis has only succeeded in fundamentally destroying and confusing the whole chain of thought so transparent in the epistle.

² If we compare the Roman with the Thessalonian Epistles that represent the strongest tension between the Apostle and Judaism, we must be doubly sensible of the pacific turn which Hilgenfeld, Holsten and especially Pfloiderer have recognised in the former, more particularly in the change of his Apocalyptic perspective (comp. § 17, 7, note 3). His high-minded patriotism must already have driven him to seek to unite the historical importance of Israel in the plan of salvation with his Gentile-Apostolic universalism; and his recognition of the Old Testament revelation inevitably required him to prove his new gospel to be in all respects based on the history and teaching of the Old Testament.

that many of his views had been reached in the struggle with Jewish Christianity and unbelieving Judaism. The reason why he did not put this statement into a book but into a letter is to be found in the literary method with which circumstances had made him familiar. The fact that he addressed the epistle to the Church at Rome was, however, anything but accidental. Apart from the external occasion that impelled him just then to announce his visit to this Church, he had long recognised the importance which the Church of the world's metropolis must have in the future as the centre of the great Gentile Church, just as Jerusalem was the centre of Jewish Christianity. On the eve of a journey to Jerusalem for the purpose of cementing a firm bond between the Gentile Churches and the Jewish-Christian mother-Church by the great love-work of a collection, he wrote this Epistle to the Gentile Church of Rome, setting forth the new and yet old way of salvation which finally leads Israel *in conjunction with* the nations to the divinely appointed goal, and must put an end for ever to all strife between Gentile and Jewish Christianity. Not because this Church was threatened by Judaistic errors or disturbed in its knowledge of salvation, but because he regarded it as a matter of great importance that it should be the bearer and representative of his conception of Christianity, which first raised it to the full rank of a universal religion; for he probably knew best how incapable his own disciples or even their disciples were of appropriating it with full and comprehensive understanding. And here we are led to conjecture that the fears which he then entertained (xv. 31) suggested to his mind the idea that this epistle might possibly be his testament to the Church and in it to Christendom generally.³

³ It is altogether vain to object that this conception of the epistle makes it unique among the epistles of the Apostle, for it is and remains such under every aspect. The fact that the discussion does not here

§ 23. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

1. The inscription of the Epistle to the Romans appears much extended, owing to the fact that Paul not only tells who he is and whom he addresses, but states that he is entitled by his own personal character as well as theirs, to turn to those with whom he has hitherto had no personal relations (i. 1-7). Inasmuch as he is the Apostle of the Gentiles, he turns to the Christians at Rome, because they too as the called of Jesus Christ, belong to the Gentiles; and his Divine calling directs him to them. But whilst he defines this calling as having given him a Divine message to announce which had been already revealed in the Old Testament, inasmuch as his gospel treats of Jesus Christ, our exalted Lord, as the Son of God, whose descent from the seed of David as well as His exaltation to Divine glory was promised by the prophets, he already gives expression to the fundamental idea of his whole epistle according to which he designs to set forth the salvation promised to Israel as a universal one.¹ He begins with the usual thanksgiving for the faith of his readers and with the expression of a long-cherished wish he had hitherto been prevented carrying out (i. 8-13), viz. to come into personal relations with them profitable to both. He then proceeds to account for his readiness to make known the gospel to them also in writing without being ashamed of it notwithstanding their culture,

pass freely from one point to another, in keeping with the style of the epistle, but that the separate leading points of view, visibly premeditated, are taken up in orderly sequence, cannot be got rid of by a polemic, conciliatory or apologetic view of the epistle. Nor does this by any means prevent the chain of thought being interrupted here and there by a lively appeal on the writer's part to his readers, as well as by the necessary application.

¹ Little as he justifies his calling to be an Apostle to the Gentiles or defends it against attacks, since he prefers to take it for granted and justify his writing on the basis of it, just as little does the description of his message as that promised by the prophets, contain any reference to the questions in dispute between him and the Jewish Christians.

by his feeling of obligation towards all Gentiles (i. 14 f.). But while making the nature of the gospel his foundation for this boldness, he is led to that utterance respecting its substance which has justly been regarded as the proper theme of the epistle. If it is a power of God unto salvation to *every one* that believes, to the highly cultured Greek as well as the Jew, it has no need to be ashamed before human culture and wisdom, which, however great they may be, can never effect that result. The gospel has this power because it reveals a righteousness of God for believers, to whom the old Scriptures had already promised life and deliverance from destruction (i. 16 f.).²

2. In a graphic way the first division sets forth as a foundation the fact that Paul need not be ashamed of the gospel, if by revealing a Divine righteousness it is a power of God unto salvation, since apart from it there is only a revelation of Divine wrath. Hence he offers a thing that is absolutely new and indispensable (i. 18). And this is first shown to the Gentiles, who, made inexcusable by the Divine revelation of nature, have turned aside from the God whom they might have known (i. 19 ff.) and by reason of a Divine judgment of wrath have fallen into the foolishness of idolatry (i. 22 f.), thence into unnatural lusts (i. 24-27), sinking finally into complete moral apathy (i. 28-32).¹ But even

² Hence our epistle is not occupied with a system of Christian doctrine but exclusively with the exposition of the way of salvation revealed in the gospel; and the fundamental idea of the epistle is again condensed into the statement that this way of salvation is already described in the Old Testament and that it was first designed for Israel, but is now disclosed to every believing Gentile. It is not the *ἐκ πλοσρως* in opposition to the *ἐξ ἔργων* that is treated of, nor a justification of the Ἑλλησι in opposition to the Ἰουδαίω, but the salvation foretold in the Scriptures and therefore first designed for the Jews, which, because dependent solely on faith, is declared to be accessible and indispensable to all, even the most cultivated.

¹ It is not therefore the sinfulness of heathenism that is treated of, but its fall under the wrath of God, which makes a means of deliverance indispensable. The aim of the epistle, however regarded, which arose

those who are so ready to judge others, thus showing themselves to be inexcusable if they do the same things, fall under Divine judgment that looks not to prerogative but to deeds, and in the day of wrath strikes the Jew first and then the Greek (ii. 1-10). On the other hand the possession of a law forms no protection to the Jews, especially as the heathen have properly speaking one also, by transgressing which they dishonour God (ii. 11-24). Nor can circumcision protect them, since it is worthless unless followed by circumcision of the heart (ii. 25-29). It has indeed a permanent value that cannot be lost, because of the faithfulness of God; but the Jew must not therefore hope to escape judgment, if by his unbelief he only contributes to the glorious confirmation of God's truth (iii. 1-8).² But if, as a reason for all having fallen under wrath, it has hitherto been taken for granted that Jews and Greeks are alike sinners and devoid of righteousness, this is now expressly proved from Scripture (iii. 9-18), the premiss being

out of the need of the Roman Church, makes no such proof necessary; it can only be explained on the supposition that the discussion is fundamentally designed to set forth the need of a new way of salvation as common to all humanity.

² This very section, couched in a vein of the liveliest polemic, avoids all reference to questions of dispute within Christianity, since the party that demanded law and circumcision, likewise desired the fulfilment of the law, whilst only the unbelieving Jew, as a Jew (possessing the law and circumcision) imagined he was certain of salvation, to whom alone therefore Paul could refer in his polemic. Even the question as to whether he did not thus abolish every privilege of Judaism (iii. 1), that had certainly been put before him frequently in his struggles with Judaism, does not here come up in order to be settled apologetically, but solely in order to show by the first privilege he names, how little such can avail to exempt the Jew from punishment. The very way in which he exemplifies this in his own person, whom none would regard as undeserving of punishment, if by his lie he only promoted the glory of God's truth (iii. 7), evidently refers to the judgment passed on him by unbelieving Judaism; and only when speaking of the immoral conclusion to which the contrary would lead, does he mention that this accusation has on several occasions been made against him by his adversaries, solely to deny it with indignation (iii. 8).

first laid down that the Scripture declaration respecting universal human sinfulness applies also to the Jews, since the true function of the law is to lead man from his own insufficiency to the attainment of righteousness (iii. 19 f.).

3. The *second* division again takes up the theme enunciated in i. 16 f., setting forth in detail how, without the mediation of a law, a righteousness of God already declared in the Old Testament had actually been manifested to all believers without distinction, inasmuch as sinners who are entirely destitute of righteousness before God are by Him through grace declared righteous. To wit, God has in the blood of Christ set forth a means of propitiation that receives its atoning power solely by faith, that He might no longer seem to pass sin over with indifference, but might at the same time find it possible, on the ground of faith in Jesus, to declare the sinner righteous (iii. 21-26). This new decree of justification first satisfies fully the religious want, inasmuch as it excludes all boasting, and, as alone consistent with the unity of God is alike accessible to circumcised and uncircumcised (iii. 27-30). Nevertheless an old ordinance of God is not by this means made void, but is rather established (iii. 31),¹ as is already proved by the fact that such method of justification is typically established in the history of Abraham. Paul begins by showing how the im-

¹ The premisses from which Paul proves that justification by faith alone satisfies the need of salvation for humanity set forth in the first division, would have been very unfairly obtained if he had considered himself at strife with the Jewish Christians, for they neither regarded it as necessary to exclude all boasting, nor looked on God as the God of Jew and Gentile alike in the sense here assumed. Moreover they aimed at an analogous method of justification for Gentiles as well as for Jews in the way demanded by them. Moreover iii. 31 cannot refer to the reproach that he abolished the law, since from the connection with chap. iv. there can be no question of the law here; and because the fact of *νόμον* having no article absolutely excludes a reference to the Torah as the source of the history of Divine revelation. Rather is it the exclusive aim, as already indicated in iii. 21, to prove that the new method of salvation is the same that was attested by the Old Testament.

putation of faith as righteousness, that takes place in the justification of Abraham, is a pure act of grace, and therefore precludes all human merit and consequently all boasting (iv. 1-8), and goes on to explain how, by the history of Abraham, its universal character is attested, viz. that it is designed for Gentiles as well as Jews. But since in chap. ii. the law and circumcision had already been pointed out as characteristics of the latter, it is now first shown how the very time when Abraham received this justification constitutes an intimation that participation in it is limited to his spiritual children that resemble him in faith whether circumcised or not (iv. 9-12), and again how Abraham's richest inheritance, the promise of salvation, cannot be mediated by the law but only through the righteousness of faith, and therefore belongs to the whole seed of Abraham, even to those whose father he is in a spiritual sense (iv. 13-17). For the same immutable faith in the Divine promise that procured justification for Abraham, according to the typical representation of the Scripture, will be imputed to them also for righteousness (iv. 18-25). Hence the Apostle can only conclude that justification by faith implies the full certainty of complete salvation, because the love of God experienced in it is a guarantee for the highest and last experience of this love in the final deliverance from Divine wrath (v. 1-11);² while from the historical parallel between Adam and Christ he proves that as certainly as sin and death have come on all

² The Apostle here comes to the point on which the actual controversy between him and the Judaists turned, for the latter also in a certain sense accepted blessedness through Christ that was necessarily associated with their faith in the Messiah, but made participation in the fulness of salvation dependent on going over to Judaism by the adoption of circumcision and the law. The fact that the reasoning, which is purely thetical, does not betray the slightest reference to this controversy, proves unanswerably that the Roman Epistle combats no Jewish-Christian opposition, but that the fundamental idea of Paul's Gospel (i. 16 f.) is attested in the second part by the full satisfying of the need of salvation set forth in the first.

humanity with the former, so certainly can all find righteousness and life in the latter (v. 12-19).

4. From the position that the law has only served to promote the sinful development begun with Adam, in order to give full scope to the efficacy of grace (v. 20 f.), the Apostle proceeds in the *third* part to prove that grace alone effects true righteousness; a power which the law neither has nor was intended to have. He appeals to the experience of every Christian, according to which he is made partaker of the life of Christ through baptism wherein he died to sin and rose to a new life in which he serves God alone (vi. 1-11). But he is not therefore transferred to a state of liberty in which, trusting to grace, he may calmly continue in sin (vi. 12-17)), but has only exchanged false for true freedom, or, which is the same thing, the bondage of sin for the service of righteousness, which latter proves itself to be true by leading to life, whereas the former leads to death (vi. 18-23).¹ Man, however, attains to this realization of righteousness not in spite of the fact that he is no longer under the law but because of it. The Apostle points out that the same death by which he died to sin in communion with Christ has likewise loosed the bond of obligation that bound his old natural life to the law (vii. 1-6). This was necessary, because the law, far from leading to life, only roused to opposition the sin that slumbered in man, and brought him to death, so that sin, by the way in which it

¹ That the tendency of the section is not to defend himself against the Judaistic reproach of teaching license to sin in a free state of grace (vi. 15), and even requiring it in order that grace might be the more glorified (vi. 1) appears from the fact that the practical point of his theoretical reasoning lies rather in the admonition to observe fundamental freedom from sin in the life (vi. 12'a.) and in reminding his readers that by surrender to his (free) gospel they decided for the principle of the *ὑπακοή* (vi. 16 f.), that leads to the service of righteousness and to true subjection to God. This by no means forbids the assumption that the Apostle takes up reproaches that he encountered in the strife with the Judaists, in order that in opposing them he might logically develop the results of his doctrine of grace.

turned this good of humanity into an evil, was now first revealed in all its sinfulness and corruption (vii. 7-13). This was not owing to the spiritual law of God, but to the disposition of the natural man who could readily find theoretical pleasure therein, but through the power of sin dwelling in the flesh was always entangled again in bondage to sin, as the Apostle shows by an affecting description of his own experiences under the law (vii. 14-25). It is no polemic or apologetic tendency, but the fundamental thought of the epistle that made it necessary to prove at such length how the law was unable to effect deliverance from sin or the fulfilment of the Divine will, for which, however, it was not to blame, since such was not its appointed task. This fully appears when the Apostle goes on to show with fundamental clearness and precision how the spirit imparted in living communion with Christ, on the ground of the condemnation of sin in the sinless life of Christ, effects in the Christian that which the law could not do (viii. 1-4). Yet the proper argument on which everything turned if his free gospel were to be vindicated, is not given at all; on the contrary, he goes on at once to show in a purely practical and admonitory vein, how this only happens in the case of those who no longer walk after the flesh but after the spirit (viii. 5-13), and how the same spirit that moves us, formerly characterized as the spirit of life (viii. 2; ix. 6, 10 f., 13), guarantees fulness of salvation even amid all the sufferings of the present (viii. 14-27). In treating of the new spiritual life of the Christian he therefore returns at last to the full salvation offered in the gospel, in accordance with the fundamental theme of the epistle (i. 16 f.); hence this part refers back to the second, ending, though commonly overlooked, with a statement that this salvation is founded on the Divine election, and with the song of triumph that gives striking expression to the indestructible certainty of such salvation (viii. 28-39).

5. In speaking of Divine election, the Apostle touches upon the point that leads him to the *fourth* division of his doctrinal discussion. For this Divine election according to i. 16 is in the first place an election of Israel, and is in apparently irreconcilable opposition to the fact that Israel as a nation had on the contrary been hardened, and forfeited salvation. Here was the point in respect of which he himself felt it imperatively necessary to arrive at an understanding as to the Old Testament promise and the historical prerogative of salvation belonging to his own nation; nor was it a present or apprehended questioning of his love towards his people that led him to give such lively expression to all his sorrow for what had occurred, and his full recognition of their privileges, but his desire that he himself and his readers should realise the full magnitude of the problem in question (ix. 1-5). He endeavours to show how the Old Testament primitive history was designed to make the sons of Abraham and Isaac themselves understand the Divine promise in the sense that God would choose according to His own judgment, without regard to any merit of works, those bodily descendants of the patriarchs to whom He would fulfil His promise (ix. 6-13). There is no unrighteousness in this, since God already proclaimed the freeness of His mercy as well as of His hardening to Moses and to Pharaoh respectively (ix. 14-18), and since the creature can make no claim whatever on the Creator (ix. 19-21).¹ But now, instead of passing immediate sentence on the Jews who had already fallen under His wrath, God has endured with much long-

¹ It is a complete error to regard these details as a polemic against the carnal claims of the Jews, in which, according to the current view, Paul is said to have been misled into a one-sided development of his doctrine of election. No Jew has ever found unrighteousness in the election of Isaac before Ishmael, or of Jacob before Esau, or regarded the hardening of Pharaoh as an act of God's power and therefore excusable. But even the Judaists did not maintain that the Jews as such were chosen on account of their descent and legal works, but only that the latter were indispensable to salvation.

suffering those who were ripe for destruction, in order to glorify Himself meanwhile in the vessels of His mercy, whom He calls of the Jews *and* Gentiles, just as was foreseen in the prophecy according to which God would make those to be His people who were not His people, and on the other hand would save only a remnant of Israel (ix. 22-29). The reason why the great bulk of Israel did not attain salvation was because they sought it by their own righteousness (ix. 30-x. 3). But now the law has come to an end with Christ, through whom righteousness and salvation are offered in the gospel only to believers (x. 4-14); and it is due to their utterly inexcusable disobedience, as also foreseen in Scripture, that they have not believed (x. 15-21).³ The nation is not indeed rejected as such, since God, by the election of grace, has reserved to Himself a remnant who obtained salvation; but the rest were hardened (xi. 1-10). Paul now first sets forth how, according to the counsel of God, this hardening must necessarily serve to turn salvation to the Gentiles, but that the final aim of the Gentile mission consists in the restoration of Israel, which, as the grafting of the natural branches into the noble tree of the theocracy, is always easier than to graft cuttings of the wild olive, a thing that has nevertheless been done successfully (xi. 11-24). The Apostle makes the prophetic announcement that this object will be attained at a future time, in full accordance

³ It is a misinterpretation to make chap. x. refer to the Gentile mission, and is quite at variance with the context. For x. 14 ff. only sets forth that there can be no appeal to the name of Jesus, such as alone leads to salvation, without faith in the message of those sent by God, whom, however, the Jews did not receive; and in x. 18 ff. the inexcusableness of their unbelief is proved by the fact that they had certainly heard the message that had gone forth into all the world, and that they must have sufficiently understood what even the Gentiles had understood. And since there is not a word in ix. 24 f. to indicate that the call of the Gentiles there spoken of was mediated by a Gentile mission, much less by that of Paul, the conception of a justification of this mission loses all support.

with prophecy, though not until after the conversion of the Gentile world; and when he then breaks out into praise of the Divine wisdom, that has by inscrutable means succeeded in reaching the goal of Israel's election in such a way as to make salvation available for all even the Gentiles (xi. 25-36), it is clear that the aim of this section is not the justification of his Gentile mission, but the solution of the darkest problem of the history of Divine salvation, with which he himself was so deeply occupied.

6. The admonitory part of the epistle begins with a profound exhortation to present themselves a sacrifice well-pleasing to God (xii. 1 f.), and then goes on to explain how Christian modesty should prove itself by the application of the diverse gifts of each to the service of all (xii. 3-8), following this up by pointing out, though in a free and even heterogeneous mixture of thought, the various evidences of brotherly love (xii. 9-16), coming finally to the proper treatment of enemies (xii. 17-21). If this first section deals mainly with the life of the community, chap. xiii. takes up the shaping of individual life. The relation of the individual to the ruling powers is here discussed (xiii. 1-6), the examination being extended to all other forms of duty (xiii. 7-10), while, in conclusion, purification and preservation of personal life are required (xiii. 11-14).

Since we have shown the current view, that the exhortation to be subject to rulers refers to the special needs of the (alleged Jewish-Christian) Roman Church, to be untenable (§ 22, 3), this section, treating of the regulation of the virtuous Christian life from an entirely theoretical point of view and without any reference to special exigencies of the Church, holds a unique place in Paul's epistles, like the discussions of the doctrinal division that advance almost systematically. The fact is the more significant that it presents throughout the most striking points of contact with the first Epistle of Peter; and to such extent that the Pauline exhortations appear throughout as full and free developments of the short and knotty gnomes of Peter bringing his own peculiarities into prominence.¹ If we add that the peculiar linking and adjustment of two

¹ The very exhortation to self-sacrifice in xii. 1 f. that appears in the

Scripture citations in Rom. ix. 33 are not only similar in 1 Pet. ii. 6 f., but in the latter alone are required by the connection, the conjecture that Paul was acquainted with the first Epistle of Peter, and that his pithy sayings are frequently in his mind in this section, is almost inevitable. To suppose that this view touches the originality of the Pauline spirit and Pauline authorship too closely is pure prejudice. Comp. Weiss, *der petrinische Lehrbegriff*, Berlin, 1855 (V., 4), and *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1865, 4 (against Möller, *deutsche Zeitschr. für christl. Wissenschaft*, etc., 1856, 39, 46 f.).

It is quite otherwise with the section xiv. 1-xv. 13, treating of the case in which regard for the life of the community comes into collision with individual claims. We here find ourselves at once transported into the concrete circumstances of the Roman Church. There were in it persons weak in faith who scrupulously avoided the use of flesh and wine and strictly observed certain fast days; there were also strong persons who looked down with contempt on such scruples, while the weak were only too ready to throw doubt on the true conscientiousness of the strong in their Christian walk. Paul declares the whole subjective dispute to be a matter of indifference; it is only necessary that each one should in his own way, with conscientious conviction, serve the Lord to whom alone he is responsible, and that none should judge or despise another (xiv. 5-12). He then proceeds to argue, exactly as in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, that if the strong

same form nowhere else in Paul, recalls 1 Pet. ii. 5, a passage closely interwoven with the details of that epistle (comp. the peculiar expressions *λογικός* and *συσχηματίζεσθαι*). The section xii. 3-8 looks like a development of 1 Pet. iv. 10 (comp. the peculiar position of *διακονία* beside *προφητεία*), xii. 9-16 like a variation on the theme 1 Pet. iii. 8 down to the peculiar combination of the exhortation in xii. 16, properly belonging to the first section, with the admonition to brotherly love (comp. also xii. 9 f. with 1 Pet. i. 22, ii. 17; xii. 13 with 1 Pet. iv. 9; xii. 14, 18 with 1 Pet. iii. 9, 11); while the closing exhortation of the chapter (xii. 20 f.) touches very closely on a favourite idea of the Petrine Epistle (ii. 12, 15, iii. 1 f., 16 f.). Still more closely does xiii. 1-6 follow 1 Pet. ii. 13 f., though peculiar in form throughout (comp. the *ὑπερέχειν*, the *ἐκαιερός ἀγαθοποιῶν* and the *ἐκδίκησις κακοποιῶν*), xiii. 7 f. again reading like a variation of 1 Pet. ii. 17 and xiii. 13 f. recalling 1 Pet. iv. 3 in a striking way.

person offend the weak one and lead him to do that which is against his conscience, Christian love requires the renunciation of a lawful enjoyment rather than to destroy the salvation of his brother (xiv. 13-23). Herein consists true tolerance, as manifested by Christ who suffered many things for the sake of others; and this course alone promotes that true union in which God Himself instructs us in the Scriptures (xv. 1-6). But since the dispute was actually called forth by the opposition of the Gentile-Christian majority to a Jewish-Christian minority (§ 22, 3), Paul returns to the arguments of the last doctrinal division, and finally exhorts both parties to mutual brotherly feeling, because God has glorified Himself in both,—in Israel by fidelity in fulfilling the promise given to the fathers, in the Gentiles by the manifestation of His mercy as foretold in Scripture. He concludes with a benediction (xv. 7-13).

Nevertheless, where the differences in the Roman Church are concerned, the question by no means turns on the maintenance of Jewish legality, as some modern expositors still hold after the example of patristic expositors, for Paul, judging by all the doctrinal arguments of the epistle, would have taken up a very different position with respect to such opposition. Moreover the Old Testament by no means forbids all use of flesh and wine, and the days of whose observance xiv. 5 treats, cannot from the connection be Jewish festivals, but only days of fasting. For the same reason we cannot agree with Neander and some of the Fathers in assuming a reference to the sacrifice of flesh and wine, but only, as is now almost universally conceded, to an asceticism that looks with suspicion on all enjoyment beyond what is necessary, and imposes special exercises of abstinence on itself. Since Ritschl this phenomenon has generally been traced back, probably with justice, to the intrusion of Essene principles into the Christian Church. Nor is it at all impossible that Gentile Christianity may also have been led to similar asceticism by the intrusion of neo-Pythagorean doctrines and rites, as Eichhorn maintained; but according to Rom. xv. 7 ff., this could only apply to the Church of Rome in isolated cases. It is certain however from the position Paul takes up on the question, that the assumption of a dualistic principle underlying this asceticism, as Baur supposes in the case of the Ebionites here said to be attacked (§ 22, 4, note 1), cannot be entertained.

7. In conclusion Paul justifies his writing to the Church at Rome, of which he is persuaded that it needed only to be reminded of all that he had put before it, by a reference to his Gentile apostolic calling, whose proper task he regards as fulfilled in his missionary sphere hitherto (xv. 14-21). The fact is generally overlooked that he only now goes back to the introduction of his epistle (i. 13), in which he had not yet announced his visit, but had only spoken of his desire to visit them and the hindrances that had hitherto prevented him carrying out his wish, preparatory to telling them that now at last he really intended to visit them on his projected missionary journey to Spain, which he meant to undertake after the collection-journey to Jerusalem had been accomplished (xv. 22-29). In this hope he commends himself to their prayers in face of the danger that threatened him, and concludes with a benediction (xv. 30-33).

Following the example of Marcion (comp. Origen on Romans x. 43) Baur, Zeller, Schwegler and Holsten pronounced the last two chapters of the Roman Epistle spurious (comp. esp. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849, 4); it being necessary for Baur to do this because they were directly at variance with his conception of the Apostle's anti-Judaism (xv. 4, 8), of the anti-Pauline Judaism of the Roman Church (xv. 14 ff.) and of the Gentile apostolic undertakings of Paul (xv. 19). The intended visit is said to be here transferred to the through-journey to Spain and accounted for in an unhistorical way by the completion of his Oriental mission contradictory to chap. i. (where however it is not spoken of at all); meaningless repetitions and borrowings from the Corinthian Epistles, as well as the list of notabilities in the Roman Church being said to mark the section as the work of a Pauline disciple who, in the spirit of the author of the Acts, wished to give a softening counterpoise to the harsh anti-Judaism of the Apostle, in the interest of peace (comp. against this Kling, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1837, 3). This view was modified by Lucht (*Ueber die beiden letzten Cap. des Römerbriefs*, Berlin, 1871) in such a way as that the original abrupt conclusion of the epistle was designedly laid aside at an early period, was replaced in Marcionitic circles simply by the concluding doxology and in catholic circles by a revision in which much that is Pauline is still retained (comp. Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1874, 4). Volkmar in his *Römerbrief* has even attempted to determine the different additions made to the genuine close of the letter (xv.

33; xvi. 1 f., 21-24) according to the years when they were appended. Yet even Hilgenfeld, Schenkel, and Pfeiderer have constantly adhered to the genuineness of the two chapters, and last of all Mangold has defended them in a brilliant way. Dr. Paulus considered chaps. xv. and xvi. to be two independent supplements addressed to the authorities of the Church, on account of the concluding doxology being found in some MSS. after xiv. 23 and the absence of the chapters in Marcion (comp. also Schenkel in his *Bibellez.*, V.); and Eichhorn, after the example of Griesbach, even separates them into a large number of different, independent leaflets. But there is no doubt that Marcion left out the chapters solely because they did not suit his anti-Judaism, conduct which harmonizes with his treatment of the Pauline Epistles (comp. § 8, 6).

Now follows a recommendation of Phœbe (xvi. 1 f.), a deaconess at Cenchrea, and a long series of salutations to different persons, many of whom we have every reason to assume, did not live in Rome (xvi. 3-15);¹ and along with an injunction to salute one another with a brotherly kiss, a greeting from all Christian Churches (xvi. 16), again followed by a series of greetings from individuals (xvi. 21-23). But the warning against errorists (xvi. 17-20), who are nowhere mentioned in the great doctrinal part of the epistle, is quite incomprehensible, especially as the joy of the Apostle in the obedience of those addressed (xvi. 19) points beyond doubt to a Church founded by himself. Hence this piece concluding with a special benediction (xvi. 20) was a sepa-

¹ Aquila and Priscilla (xvi. 3) had dwelt a year before in Ephesus, according to 1 Cor. xvi. 19, and it is implied that they were living there even later (2 Tim. iv. 19); Epænetus, the firstfruits of Asia (xvi. 5), we should rather look for in Ephesus, where Paul first laboured in Asia Minor; the relatives who shared his captivity (xvi. 7, comp. ver. 11), Urbanus, who was his fellow-labourer (xvi. 9), the mother of Rufus who showed him motherly love (xvi. 13), the household who appear to have been converted without their masters (xvi. 10 f.), and a series of persons whose services to the readers or to Christianity he seemed to know by intuition (xvi. 6, 10, 12); all these we should most naturally expect to find in his former mission-field. Though it is not impossible that Paul had become acquainted with a number of Church-members, directly or indirectly, and used all his connections with Rome as links for salutations to them, yet endless hypotheses are required to imagine that all these persons inhabited Rome, agreeably to what Paul says of them.

rate letter of recommendation to Phœbe for Ephesus, which got into the Roman Epistle because, in travelling to Rome by Ephesus, she brought our epistle thither.² Then follow greetings from Timothy and some relatives of the Apostle, from Tertius his amanuensis and from Corinthian friends (xvi. 21-23); finally, as xvi. 24 is spurious, and a concluding benediction has already been appended, a solemn doxology takes its place, in which, with a glance directed to the gospel preached in the epistle and in pursuance of the conclusion of the great doctrinal part, the wisdom of God is extolled, the Church being commended to Him (xvi. 25-27).³

² This view, already indicated by Keggermann (*de duplice ep. ad Rom. appendice*, Hal., 1767) and Semler in his paraphrase of the Roman Epistle (Halle, 1767), was established by David Schulz (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1829, 4), and has been essentially adopted by Schott, Reuss, Laurent, Sabatier and others. We must not however, with Hansrath, separate xvi. 17-20, or with Ritsehl (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1866), Ewald and Mangold, xvi. 1 f. from the Ephesian fragment and leave them to the Roman Epistle, much less with the two latter put the Ephesian Epistle in question into the time of the Roman captivity or with Ammon still later, because we should otherwise be deprived of every natural explanation as to how it came into our Roman Epistle. H. Schultz (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Th.*, 1876, 1) arbitrarily attempted to transfer xii. 1-xv. 7 also into this Ephesian Epistle written towards the end of his life. Hilgenfeld and Meyer have persistently opposed the whole hypothesis (comp. also Seyerlen).

³ The genuineness of this doxology was first contested by Reiche and Krehl in their commentaries (1883, 45), and has even been doubted by Delitzsch. Many of those who defend the two concluding chapters reject this at least, as Hilgenfeld, Pfeiderer, Seyerlen, and Mangold, who with Volkmar hold that it originated about 145 in the interest of anti-Marcionism; while Holtzman freely ascribes it to the Autor ad Ephes. (*Krit. des Eph. und Col.-Brief*, Leipzig, 1872). But the attempt to prove its un-Pauline character has only been the result of extreme ingenuity; and although the phenomenon that the doxology follows xiv. 3 (where it is put by Hofmann and Laurent after the example of older expositors and critics) in some codd., while in others it is found in both places, or is left out altogether, can no longer be explained with certainty, it is very possible that it is in some way connected with Marcion's omission of the closing chapters.

§ 24. THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

1. In Corinth the deputies of the Churches who were to accompany the Apostle to Jerusalem, as bearers of the collection, gathered round him, and Luke among them; and Paul was on the point of embarking with them for Syria, when information that the Jews were lying in wait for him, compelled them to take the land route through Macedonia. While the deputies departed thence to Troas, the Apostle remained at Philippi with Luke during the Easter festival, following them to Troas, where they remained for seven days (Acts xx. 3-6).¹ There too his companions alone took ship at first, for Paul went to Assos on foot; and in three days they got to Miletus, where Paul had appointed to meet the Ephesian presbyters, for he was anxious to reach Jerusalem at Pentecost (xx. 7-16). The gloomy forebodings with which the Apostle had set out were confirmed anew by prophetic voices, foretelling that bonds and afflictions awaited him in Jerusalem; and he took his departure without any hope of another meeting (xx. 22-25). They then coasted as far as Patara in Lycia, where they went on board a Phœnician ship that was freighted for Tyre, and took to the open sea. Arrived at Tyre, they tarried for seven days, and Paul was once more urgently warned against the journey to Jeru-

¹ Although the Acts give no explanation respecting the companions enumerated in xx. 4, and we can no longer account for the fact that Philippi, with the Galatian and Achaian Churches, do not appear to be represented, while Berea and Thessalonica and the Churches of Lycaonia and Asia Minor are fully so, there can scarcely be a doubt that the passage refers to the deputies whom Paul, according to 1 Cor. xvi. 3 f., was to take with him if the collection proved large. The ἀρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας is of course spurious, since Trophimus was in Jerusalem (xxi. 9) and Aristarchus still in Cæsarea with the Apostle (xxvii. ii.). But Luke cannot have first attached himself to the Apostle at Philippi, much less the others in Macedonia, for the συνέπτερο (xx. 4) plainly shows that they had already accompanied him on the journey through Macedonia, and could only have left him at some point of the Macedonian coast; while the ἡμᾶς (ver. 5) presupposes that they had formerly accompanied the Apostle along with the author of the Acts.

salem, while in Cæsarea the prophet Agabus expressly foretold his captivity and delivery to the Romans. But Paul could not be induced to give up the journey, for he believed it was divinely appointed. Thus, accompanied by brethren from Cæsarea, they reached Jerusalem, where Paul and his companions took up their quarters with Mnason a Cyprian (xxi. 1-17). Whether the Apostle obtained his desire to be in Jerusalem at Pentecost, cannot now be ascertained, for the account of the journey is by no means exact in all particulars; but it is very improbable, owing to the unavoidable delays of the sea-voyage and the fact that Paul evidently made no further haste during the latter part of the journey. When he presented himself before James and the elders, he was advised, in order to appease the ill-feeling of certain Jewish Christians zealous of the law, who professed to have heard that he led the Jews of the Diaspora to apostatize from that law, to take the Nazarite vow along with some pious Jews and to pay the cost of it, which he willingly agreed to do (xxi. 18-26).² But even before he could complete the necessary ceremonies, the Asiatic Jews stirred up an insurrection of the people against him, under the pretext that he

² It may be affirmed most positively that according to 1 Cor. vii. 18 Paul was able to deny the report that he had led those who were Jews by birth to apostasy from the law, and had particularly instructed them not to have their children circumcised any more, as a calumny, since his doctrine of the essential freedom, even of Jews, from the law, was by no means at variance with the fact that he told those who were circumcised to remain in that state of life in which they received the call. Nor could he object, after what he had said in 1 Cor. ix. 20, to show by an act of Jewish piety that had nothing to do with justification before God either in his view or that of the Nazarites in company with whom he solemnized it, that he was no enemy to the law, as even Pfeleiderer (in his *Paulinism*) concedes. This, however, does not prevent Luke's assumption, that the heads of the Church at Jerusalem did not from the first share the suspicion against Paul, from being somewhat incorrect, nor yet the way in which, in xxi. 24 he represents the character of the Nazarite vow, especially as he has not even interpreted their appeal to the Jerusalem decrees correctly (comp. § 14, 4, note 3).

had taken Trophimus an Ephesian, with whom he had been seen the day before, into the temple (*i.e.* into the fore-court of the Jews), and had thus polluted it. The military tribune Claudius Lysias interposed, and after Paul had in vain sought to quiet the people by the discourse he was permitted to make, he commanded him to be led away. It was only by appealing to his Roman citizenship that he escaped scourging (xxi. 27–xxii. 29). The next day the tribune brought him before the Sanhedrim; but when Paul succeeded in interesting the Pharisaic party on his behalf, the council divided, and he was led back to the Castle of Antonia (xxii. 30–xxiii. 11). The tribune, however, on receiving information through Paul's sister's son, of a conspiracy by which Paul was to be assassinated at his next appearance before the Sanhedrim, sent the prisoner under a strong military escort to the procurator of Cæsarea, to whom he gave an account of him; and Claudius Felix put him under guard in the Pretorium that bore the name of Herod, because it had formerly been a palace of his (xxiii. 12–35). After five days the high-priest Ananias came to Cæsarea with a Greek orator as advocate, and made a formal charge against him of schism and violating the temple. Paul disallowed the fact, and the procurator deferred judgment. Nor did a hearing before Felix's Jewish wife lead to any result, and when after two years the governor was recalled, he left Paul a captive to his successor, out of complaisance to the Jews (chap. xxiv.).

2. *Cæsarea*, an important city with a good harbour, situated on the Mediterranean Sea, was built by Herod the Great on the site of Strato's Tower, and received its name in honour of the Emperor. Here the procurators of Judea resided; and here Paul remained in imprisonment for fully two years. His captivity was light from the first, and he was allowed free intercourse with his friends (Acts xxiv. 23), though still in fetters and under military guard (xxiv. 27; xxvi. 29; comp. Col. iv. 3, 18; Philem. 9 f.). The procurator

hoped his release might be purchased by a bribe, and even, as it appears, had many conferences with him on the matter (xxiv. 26), so that Paul was in frequent expectation of being set free. Hence it was that on one occasion during this time he was so certain of release that he engaged quarters with Philemon at Colosse (Philem. 22). This of course presupposes that Paul, notwithstanding the final farewell he had taken at Miletus on his journey to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 25), and his eager longing to come to Rome (Rom. i. 10), had in the meantime seen urgent cause for returning to his sphere of work in Asia Minor, which naturally would not prevent his ultimate departure for Rome from that place.

It is here taken for granted that the Epistle to Philemon, as well as that to the Colossians which accompanied it, was written in Cæsarea.¹ According to the old subscription both epistles were indeed written from Rome, a view that was formerly universal, being adopted even by Holtzmann (*Kritik der Ephesen- u. Kolosserbriefe*, Leipz., 1872) and von Soden (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1885), as well as Hofmann, Klöpffer (*der Brief an die Colosser*, Berlin, 1832), W. Schmidt and L. Schulze. David Schulz and Wiggers (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1829, 1841) were the first to decide in favour of Cæsarea, and were followed by Schott, Boettger, Thiersch, Reuss, Schenkel, Hausrath, Laurent, Meyer and others. Much that is untenable has been said on both sides.² But the fact that Paul intended

¹ The same thing naturally holds good of the so-called Ephesian Epistle, but since this requires separate consideration and scarcely contributes anything to the question here discussed, it may for the present be entirely put aside.

² The position of the Apostle during his imprisonment at Rome was essentially the same as at Cæsarea. Access once being allowed to him (Acts xxiv. 23), he could preach the gospel to those who sought him as well in Cæsarea as in Rome (xxviii. 31); for the centurion on guard had in no case any means of ascertaining who belonged to his *Ἱδιαι*; and Col. iv. 3 points at any rate to a relative limitation of his ministry. All considerations as to whether the escaped slave Onesimus could turn more readily towards Rome or towards Cæsarea are entirely worthless, since we know as little of the circumstances of his flight as of those that brought him into contact with the captive Paul and led to his conversion (Philem. 10). The circle of friends that surrounded him in the latter as the former place, was in the nature of things continually

in case of his release to go from Rome to Macedonia (Phil. ii. 24) and in Philem. 22 proposes to go directly to Phrygia, is conclusive; while the way in which he already bespeaks quarters at Colosse (not in which to settle down, as Klöpper thinks, but for the time of his visit), makes it quite improbable that the letter was written in Rome, where, moreover, Paul who was undergoing a regular trial, could not have reckoned on being set free with any certainty.

This cause is manifestly to be found in accounts that the Apostle had received from the south-west of Phrygia, a district in which he had hitherto enjoyed no opportunity of working (§ 18, 1, note 1). Christian Churches already flourished there in the three towns of Laodicea, Hierapolis and Colosse, situated on the river Lycus that flowed into the Meander. A certain Epaphras belonging to the last-named town, had laboured in all three places (iv. 12 f., comp. i. 7), evidently in sympathy with Paul (comp. Col. i. 23); and may possibly have founded the Churches, which were doubtless essentially Gentile-Christian like that at Colosse (ii. 11, 13, comp. i. 24, 27). As to the time that had since elapsed we are entirely ignorant, since it is by no means clear from i. 2, as Bleek supposed, that the Church at Colosse was not yet firmly constituted. The news was brought thence by Epaphras (i. 8) who seems to have stood in a very intimate relation to the Apostle, since he bore him company in his imprisonment, alternately with Aristarchus (Philem. 23, comp. Col. iv. 10), and was therefore probably his pupil. But Philemon too, who with his wife Appia gave up his house for the meetings of the Church, must have been con-

changing, so that the fact of this account agreeing with or differing from that of Philippians or even of 2 Tim. can prove nothing. In both places Timothy is with him; and it is certain that the presence of Tychicus, Aristarchus and Luke in Cæsarea according to Acts xx. 4 f. is just as explicable as the fact that only the two latter were with him after the despatch of the Colossian Epistle (Acts xxvii. 2 f.). On the other hand it is idle to compare the statement that Tychicus only travelled from Rome through Ephesus to Colosse with the account of Eph. vi. 21 from which he seems to have been already in Colosse, since both are equally uncertain.

verted by the Apostle during his ministry in Asia Minor (Philem. 2, 19).³

According to the Chronicon of Eusebius the three towns were visited by an earthquake in the tenth year of Nero's reign (A.D. 64); according to Paul Orosius in the fourteenth year (A.D. 68). If this was the same event that according to Tacitus (*Ann.*, 14, 27) destroyed Laodicea, it belongs to an earlier date, viz. the seventh year of the Emperor (A.D. 61); in which case it is doubly improbable that the Colossian Epistle was written from Rome, since a letter written so soon after the catastrophe might certainly be expected to contain some reference to it. But if the epistle dates from Cæsarea, it may very probably have been written before the catastrophe.

3. The news from the Phrygian Churches, that had visibly caused the Apostle great uneasiness, reported the appearance there of a Jewish-Christian party who, it is true, did not, like the Pharisaic party, entirely destroy the foundations of his doctrine of grace by their preaching of the law, but on the other hand seriously imperilled a healthy development of the Christian faith and life. It does not appear that it in any way attacked the faith that rested on the simple apostolic announcement of salvation, but it promised to lead beyond this to a higher state of perfection (comp. Col. i. 28), to the true consummation (*πλήρωσις*, comp. ii. 10) of Christian knowledge and Christian life. The first was to be brought about by initiation into a peculiar theosophic speculation, to which as a higher wisdom or philosophy no little value was attached (ii. 8, 18, 23), and which was above all to open up a view into the whole extent and fulness of

³ In any case according to Philem. 2 Archippus must also have belonged to the family that held a post in the Church at Colosse (Col. iv. 17), even if he were not, as Klöpffer supposes, the representative of Epaphras; and he must evidently have laboured in opposition to the new errors, just as the Apostle did, since Paul calls him his *σωτηριώτης*. Nor had the Apostle any lack of personal acquaintances in Laodicea (Col. iv. 15) probably made during his Ephesian ministry, but he was certainly unknown by face to the Churches of that district according to ii. 1. It is only by laboured explanation of the passage that this has been denied by David Schulz and Wiggers (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1829, 1838).

the Divine essence (*πλήρωμα*, comp. i. 19, ii. 9). It was certainly not denied that this had been revealed in Christ; but it was supposed to have also unfolded itself in diverse ranks of higher spirits (i. 16), into which a deeper insight, probably by means of visions (ii. 18) was hoped for. It was supposed that the highest step of knowledge itself would be characterized by a feeling of utter unworthiness to approach the full glory of God of which so overpowering an impression had been received, and that it would be enough to see it in the angels and through them to come into mysterious contact with the Godhead, so that the angels themselves became the object of a kind of Divine worship (ii. 23, comp. 18). With this theosophy was associated an asceticism based on the spiritualistic view that closer intercourse with the higher heavenly world was possible in proportion to freedom from all contact with the perishable world of sense (ii. 21 f.); on which account strict abstinence in meat and drink was imposed (ii. 16). This led, though in a different way from the Pharisaic teaching of the law, back to a state of legality, in which Paul could only see a relapse into a stage of religion that had already been surmounted (ii. 20). In this way the rules of life laid down by the Mosaic law even came to be regarded not indeed as a condition of the attainment of salvation, but yet as the form of life that most closely corresponded to the standpoint of Christian perfection. Hence probably the high value attached to circumcision (ii. 11; iii. 11), by which the whole life of the body was from the first consecrated to God in a strict sense; and to the Jewish festivals (ii. 16) by which the daily life was supposed to gain a higher consecration, unless, as in Galatia, it served simply to commend the whole system to the Gentile-Christian consciousness that was not satisfied with the bald worship of the ancient Christians. Paul perceived the whole danger of this tendency in which the unique majesty and dignity of Christ were threatened by His incorporation

in the Pleroma that embraced the whole spirit-world of heaven, the full sufficiency of His saving mediation by the worship of angels, and the sound development of Christian faith and life by a new system. He saw how the Phrygian people, always disposed to religious enthusiasm, were only too susceptible to such theosophic asceticism, and how it would at least unsettle the Churches once more as to whether they possessed in simple faith to Christ the true way of salvation and the certainty of future blessedness (comp. i. 23, ii. 2, 18, comp. i. 5, 27).

This disturbance of the Phrygian Churches naturally proceeded neither from Jews, as Eichhorn and Schneckenburger (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1832, 4) held, nor from heathen philosophers as the Church Fathers supposed, since Paul measured their teaching by the standard of Christian duty (ii. 19), but from Jewish Christians, as their high estimate of circumcision and Jewish festivals shows. But since they traced their theosophic doctrines as well as their asceticism back to ancient tradition (ii. 8, 22), they must have been allied to Essenism, the only department of Judaism where such tradition was current, and whose influence we have already encountered in Roman Jewish Christianity (§ 23, 6). This view, already adopted by Chemnitz, Storr and Credner, has recently become predominant, for Hofmann, who habitually ignores all historical interpretation of such phenomena and puts an arbitrary construction of his own on them, does not come into account. The tendency was formerly designated cabbalistic (comp. Osiander *Tüb. Zeitschrift*, 1834, 3 following Herder); but the Cabbala is a much later development, whose deepest roots can only be traced back to theosophic Judaism. If, with Neander, Schott and Grau (comp. Clemens, *Zeitschrift. f. wis. Theol.*, 1871), we identify the tendency with precursors of the Gnostics, yet the very beginnings of Gnosticism go back in some way to theosophic Jewish Christianity. But we must entirely reject Bleek's view that those who made their appearance at Colosse were Pharisaic Jewish Christians, or that Pharisaic Jewish Christians there carried on their work side by side with Essenes and Gnostics, as Reuss maintained; for the system attacked never goes back directly to the Old Testament, but takes its stand on human traditions, while Paul never appeals to the Old Testament, as he does in the Galatian Epistle, his polemic being entirely different from that against the legal Judaists.

4. Paul could not remain simply on the defensive where this new tendency was concerned. He perceived that it met

a deeply seated want of Christian endeavour after knowledge; and he was persuaded, as we know from 1 Cor. ii., that the gospel concealed a Divine wisdom that was fully able to satisfy such need. The comparative restraint of his imprisonment gave him sufficient time and rest to penetrate into the depths of this Divine wisdom. It was only necessary to follow up the train of thought that had led him from the Divine glory of the exalted Christ to infer His pre-existence and activity (comp. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, 4 Aufl., Berlin, 1884, § 79), in order from his point of view to show how the whole fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ (Col. i. 19, ii. 9); and from this relation to all created things, including all ranks of heavenly beings (i. 16 f., ii. 10) to demonstrate the central cosmic significance of Christ. The saving work of Christ also which he had hitherto regarded only from the standpoint of a human need of salvation now appeared in a new light, inasmuch as the victory over powers hostile to God was gained by Christ, and his kingly dominion set up in their place (ii. 15, comp. i. 13). Thus a way was opened for closing once more the breach that sin had made in the Divine world of spirits, by leading up to Him who was destined to be their head (i. 20, comp. i. 16, ii. 10); just as the opposition between heaven and earth had already been done away in a certain sense (iii. 1 ff.). Moreover in the apprehension of this Divine wisdom, Paul perceived a higher stage of Christian development, but found it necessary to lay the more stress on the fact that all treasures of wisdom and knowledge were hidden in the secret of salvation that his gospel announced, the revelation of which would lead finally not to the satisfying of the desire for knowledge but to participation in the fulness of salvation (ii. 2 f., comp. i. 5, 20 f.). In proportion as the increasing tendency to speculation threatened to bring about a split in parties and schools, he found it necessary to give prominence to the organic unity of the Church under Christ

its head (i. 18, 24, ii. 19) and the universal character of the gospel by which it had been founded (i. 6, 23). In opposing the errors of a false asceticism that rested on false theosophy, he was forced not only to lay stress on the general proposition that all growth in knowledge must result in the fulfilment of the Divine will (i. 9 f.), and must tend to the complete renewal of the moral man (ii. 9 ff.), but also to prove in detail that Christian sanctification is shown not in the carrying out of arbitrary enactments, but in the reorganization of domestic and social life. Hence Paul enters much more fully here than in the older Epistles into the regulation of the Christian moral life, by minute instructions regarding all such relations. He could even form a new estimate of the Old Testament law, if its fulfilment were no longer made a condition of salvation, while laying greater stress on its typical character (ii. 11, 17).

In the conflict with the principles of Judaism, its stereotyped dogmatic vocabulary naturally fell away likewise, the shibboleths that characterized its theses and antitheses disappearing by degrees. On the other hand the theosophic system had evolved a number of *termini technici* that the Apostle would on no account allow it to appropriate, but he adopted and restamped them with his own meaning. Moreover the wealth of Paul's intellect lent him new expressions for the new thoughts that stirred him at this time, giving him power to present old truths in a new form. Hence it is not strange that we should meet with new peculiarities of language in the letters written during his captivity; and miss many expressions that appear in the earlier ones. In addition to this, the party that stood over against the Apostle did not attack his doctrine of salvation, so that all necessity for its logical development, as well as for argumentation to establish it or combat its antithesis disappeared. The question turned rather on a purely thetical representation unfolding the whole depth and fulness of evangelical truth, that necessarily gave a somewhat different colouring to his mode of presentation. The language, more forcible than elsewhere, moves on in long-drawn sentences loosely connected by relatives or participial constructions, and is often somewhat encumbered by the abundance of thoughts and references flowing in upon him. Only where the polemic assumes a repellent character does it sharpen into antitheses frequently intimating more than is said.

5. The first thing that Paul did on receiving the news from Phrygia that gave him such uneasiness, was to write a letter to Laodicea, where the relations were certainly such as to give rise to the greatest apprehension. This epistle has unfortunately been lost (§ 16, 2); but the fact that he directs the Colossians to read it, and to send the letter they had received to Laodicea (Col. iv. 16), proves that the two epistles supplemented one another and were essentially directed against the same dangers. It was unquestionably the need of counteracting these by his personal influence that led him to postpone even the journey to Rome which he so eagerly desired, and to plan a visit to the Phrygian Churches immediately on his release (Philem. v. 22). Since that was still uncertain, he resolved to write fully to the Colossians also. He presents himself to them in the introductory greeting as the Apostle called by the will of God, since it is in this character that he has to speak to them (i. 1 f.). He thanks God for the good accounts he received of them through Epaphras, laying stress on the fact that the gospel they had received through this latter, which together with his own promise of salvation had become the foundation of their life of love, increased and brought forth fruit in all the world (i. 3-8). He desires their growth in the knowledge that would teach them to be fruitful and increase in the works of Christian life as well as in patience, from gratitude toward God who had fitted them for the attainment of heavenly perfection by delivering them from the power of Satan and transplanting them into the kingdom of His Son who had procured the forgiveness of their sins (i. 9-14). Forthwith he takes the opportunity of extolling the Son, as destined in His unique relation to God and to the first and second creation, to bring about the final consummation (i. 15-20), reminding them that they themselves through His saving work had already begun to participate in it and would attain the goal if they held fast by the universal

gospel (i. 21-23). Characterizing himself as the minister of this gospel, he is led to speak of himself more exactly as fulfilling his Divine calling by his sufferings and labour on behalf of the gospel, and in fulfilling it turns to them also (i. 24-ii. 3). He thus comes to speak of the danger in which they stand, and warns them against the deceitful wisdom of men that has nothing to do with Christ who is preached to them in the gospel (ii. 4-9). He then once more emphasizes the fact, for which the discussions in i. 15-23 have prepared the way, that in this Christ they have the whole fulness of the Godhead and the whole fulness of salvation, true circumcision and the new life as contrasted with their former death in sin, after He has blotted out their guilt on the cross, and gained the victory over the Satanic powers (ii. 10-15). He now warns them against relapse into ceremonial which, in spite of its foundation in the deepest humility and worship of the heavenly powers, leads only to carnal pride and is no longer appropriate to those who with Christ are dead to the world, and with Him have risen again, knowing that their true life is already in heaven (ii. 16-iii. 4). This leads him to the earthly elements that still cling to them, the heathen sins of the old man, which must give place to the new man, in whom all differences of pre-Christian life are done away in Christ (iii. 5-11); whereupon he delineates the distinguishing features of this new man as depicted in the life of the individual and of the community (iii. 12-17). Then follows in short, sharp lines, the Christian table, setting forth the duties of husbands and wives, children and parents, slaves and masters, dwelling at greater length on slaves because the need of a re-organization of their condition in the spirit of Christianity was greatest (iii. 18-iv. 1). He then commends himself to their prayers, adds a word of admonition as to their attitude towards the heathen world by which they were surrounded (iv. 2-6) and after dismissing personal matters (iv. 7-17)

concludes with a salutation in his own hand in which he beseeches them to remember his bonds (iv. 18).

From the personal matter we learn in the first place that Tychicus went to Colosse with the letter, his main object being to set the Church at rest by more particular accounts respecting his welfare, and also that he was accompanied by the converted slave Onesimus (iv. 7 ff.). Among the greetings Paul sends he mentions first of all three Jewish Christians who had been the greater comfort to him because they were his only countrymen who worked with him for the kingdom of God. Hence it appears that the rest held aloof from him from fear of being implicated in his process, and did not trouble themselves about missionary matters. These three were the Jew Aristarchus of Thessalonica (Acts xix. 29, xx. 4), the former fellow-traveller of Paul and Barnabas, John Mark (comp. § 13, 4; 15, 1), who was also on the point of setting out for Asia Minor and whom he commends to the Church; and a certain Jesus Justus (iv. 10 f.). Of his Gentile Christian fellow-workers, Epaphras, who notwithstanding his warm interest in the Phrygian Churches intended to remain with the Apostle, even sharing his captivity (Philem. v. 23) sends greeting, also the physician Luke who here meets us for the first time, and Demas (iv. 12 ff.). Paul sends greetings to Laodicea, especially to the Church in the house of Nymphas, and arranges an exchange of letters between the two Churches (iv. 15 f.). Finally he sends a word of friendly admonition to Archippus to encourage him in the office he had undertaken (iv. 17).

6. Mayerhoff (*Der Brief an die Colosser*, Berlin, 1838) was the first to attack the genuineness of the Colossian Epistle, contending that the language and method of teaching were in many respects un-Pauline. He tried to prove a dependence of this epistle on the Ephesian one and held that the heresy it combated was the Cerinthian, while Neander and F. Nitzsch (in his *Anmerkungen* on Bleek's *Vorlesungen über die Briefe an die Kol., Philem., Eph.*, Berlin, 1865) thought it referred to the precursors of this heresy. Ewald too (*Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, 1857, comp. Renan) thought that the difference between it and the old Paulines could only be explained on the hypothesis that Timothy drew up the epistle after previously discussing its contents with the Apostle; Paul dictating more and more towards the close, and finally adding the conclusion with his own hand. Baur's

criticism was still more trenchant. From his standpoint, that the teaching of the four great epistles is the sole criterion of Paulinism, he regarded (comp. his *Paulus*, 1845) all that went beyond this teaching as an indication that the epistle had its origin in a circle permeated by Gnostic ideas, holding that the *πλήρωμα* was the Gnostic Pleroma and the heavenly powers the Gnostic æons. He looked upon it as an attack on Ebionism, and in the mention of the Petrine Mark and the Pauline Luke, saw the union-tendency of the epistle, also shown in the emphasis laid on the unity of the Church. Schwegler in his *Nachap. Zeitalter* (1846), sought to prove more fully that the author endeavoured by means of the growing Gnostic tendency to suppress Essene Ebionism; and by the *ἐπίγνωσις* and *ἀγάπη* to do away with the original antithesis of the apostolic age between *πίστις* and *ἔργα* (comp. on the other side Klöpffer, *De Origine Epist. ad Eph. et Col.*, Gryph., 1852). To this view the Tübingen school in its stricter sense has adhered (comp. Plank and Köstlin in *d. Theol. Jahrbüchern*, 1847, 50) down to Hilgenfeld, who, however, again returned to the opinion that the polemic of the epistle was directed mainly against Cerinthus and therefore went back to the time of Hadrian. A new phase of criticism was inaugurated by Holtzmann in his *Krit. d. Eph.-u. Colosserbriefe* (Leipzig, 1872). After the example of Hitzig he tried to prove that indications of genuineness and spuriousness, as of originality and dependence with respect to the Ephesian Epistle, were interwoven in this epistle, and therefore attempted critically to extract a genuine Pauline Epistle to the Colossians from our epistle, which the Autor ad Ephesios, after having imitated it in his leading epistle, on his side again interpolated (comp. also Hönig in *d. Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1872, 1). He was followed in the main by Hausrath in his *NTliche Zeitgeschichte* (1874) and Immer in his *NTliche Theol.* (1877); while Pfeleiderer in his *Paulinismus* (1873) only denied that the interpolation was due to the

Autor ad Ephesios Not only, however, did Reuss and Schenkel (*Christusbild d. Apostel*, 1879) adhere to the genuineness of the whole epistle, but Klöpffer in his *Kommentar* (1882) again defended it in detail, and endeavoured to prove the indefensibility of the hypothetical genuine Pauline epistle (comp. also Grimm, *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 1883, 2). Finally v. Soden (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1885), with whom Mangold seems to agree, again made a most careful examination of Holtzmann's hypothesis and proved that most of what he had rejected was not un-Pauline, and neither showed a dependence on the Ephesian Epistle nor other ground of objection. In spite of this, he too rejects i. 15-20, ii. 10, 15 and ii. 18 b, which naturally does away with the hypothesis of interpolation; for if the object were really to attack an advanced opposition in the name of the Apostle, the interpolator would certainly not have been satisfied with this indirect reference to it, which moreover is lost in its aphoristic form. Nor is there any historical reason why we should not suppose that the doctrine of angels combated in these passages was already embraced by Jewish-Christian theosophists; or, if an advance of Paulinism side by side with opposing developments be once conceded, why we should not assume that it went so far as the utterances in these passages. But the personal allusions of the epistle, that could only to a very small extent have been drawn from Philem. 23, form a powerful argument in favour of the genuineness.

7. The slave Onesimus, who accompanied Tychicus to Colosse (Col. iv. 9), carried with him to his master a letter in the Apostle's own hand (Philem. v. 19). When Paul converted him (v. 10) he had enjoined upon him as a duty to return at once to his master from whom he had escaped. After the introductory greeting, he begins with the usual thanksgiving for all the good he had heard of Philemon (v. 1-7); and although he might with

propriety command, he, the aged Paul in bonds, would only give him a word of exhortation with respect to his spiritual child who had become so dear to him and who would now do honour to his name, as he adds with a slight touch of humour (v. 8-12). He would gladly have retained him in his service, but had no wish to compel Philemon to make him this present; and it might be that Onesimus was given back to his master that he should henceforth be a beloved brother to him instead of a slave (v. 13-16). The question of giving him his freedom is not mooted: it was unnecessary if Philemon received him as he would receive the Apostle, who in conclusion half jestingly binds himself in writing to pay all the loss he had suffered through the slave, reminding him however that he could easily make a larger counter-reckoning against Philemon as being indebted to him for all that he had, and might demand that he should be to him a true Onesimus (v. 17-20). Only at the end, in expressing his confidence that Philemon would do still more than he required of him, do we find a possible allusion to the Apostle's release, unless the wish to keep this child of his imprisonment entirely for his constant service be here intimated. He already bespeaks lodgings in the hope of soon being free, sends greeting from the same fellow-workers as in the Colossian Epistle with the exception of Jesus Justus, and concludes with a benediction (v. 21-25). The close connection of this undoubtedly genuine monument of the Apostle's delicate tact and genial amiability with the Colossian Epistle forms no unimportant point in favour of the genuineness of the latter.

Wieseler (*de Epistola Laodicena*, Gött., 1844) transferred Philemon to Laodicea, in which he was followed by Thiersch and Laurent, presumably because Archippus, who according to vers. 2 was so closely connected with him, must from Col. iv. 17 have been a Laodicean; although Onesimus according to Col. iv. 9 was a Colossian, and was sent to Colosse. But his assumption that the Epistle to Philemon is the one mentioned in Col. iv. 16, which the Colossians were to receive

from Laodicea, is quite absurd. Holtzmann in this respect following Hitzig's footsteps, even puts Philemon and his house at Ephesus, and in the epistle addressed to him, especially in vers. 4-6, finds additions of the Autor ad Ephesios (*Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, 3), because in fact the epistle, from its resemblance to the Colossian Epistle, proves that it proceeded from the same hand and was written at the same time. Baur alone has ventured to pronounce it spurious, though this is the natural consequence of the rejection of the Colossian Epistle; but his assertion that we have here the germ of a Christian romance, afterwards drawn out in the recognition and reunion scenes of the pseudo-Clementine homilies, is rejected even by Hilgenfeld, though very inconsistently.

§ 25. THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

1. The Epistle of Paul bearing the inscription *πρὸς Ἐφεσίου* in all our MSS., is closely connected with that to the Colossians. The Apostle begins by addressing his readers simply as the saints, who are likewise believers in Christ Jesus (i. 1); since the *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* was unquestionably wanting in the oldest text. Marcion cannot have read it, because he considered the epistle as addressed to the Laodiceans; nor can Tertullian, since he accuses him of falsifying the titulus (*i.e.* the inscription), but not the text, and yet he does not appeal to the text against him, but only to the *veritas ecclesiæ*, *i.e.* the tradition contained in the inscription, which alone was correct in his view. Neither did Origen find the words in his text (comp. Cramer, *Catena in Epp. Pauli.*, Oxford, 1842, p. 102). Basil expressly testifies that they were not in the old manuscripts (*contra Eunom.* 2, 19), and Jerome (1, 1) can only combat that interpretation of the address which implies the want of the *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, by setting against it the *opinion* of others, that these words stood there in writing, while they are wanting in our two oldest Codd. (Vatic. and Sin.).¹ The whole character of

¹ We cannot meet this result of textual criticism by contending that the address would be unintelligible without the *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*. Basil's fanciful way of explaining the address by supposing that the Christians

the epistle is in harmony with this general address. It is true i. 15 does not state that Paul had *only* heard of the faith of his readers; but the way in which he gives it simply as his impression that they had heard of his Gentile apostleship (iii. 2 ff.) and had been instructed in the true doctrine of Christ (iv. 21) makes it impossible for the epistle to have been addressed to a Church founded by himself. In particular we find no allusion in it to the special needs of the Apostle or his close relation to a Church in which, as in Ephesus, he had laboured for years; the epistle contains no salutations to individuals in the Church and sends no greeting either from Timothy or Aristarchus, although they were with him at that time and had been with him at Ephesus (Col. i. 1, iv. 10, comp. Acts xix. 22, 29). The readers are repeatedly addressed as Gentile Christians (Eph. ii. 11 f., 19, iii. 1, iv. 17), although Paul had also laboured with success among the Jews at Ephesus (Acts xix. 10, xx. 21), so that the Church of that place was

were called *οἱ ὄντες* in an absolute sense on account of their communion with the existing One, only leads to the conclusion that the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* were not left out in the interest of this interpretation, a course that was not taken in Rom. i. 7 or Phil. i. 1 where the same occasion offered. It has in many cases been very ingeniously explained by recent expositors; but that the Christians should here be characterized as the N.T. members of the true theocracy in distinction from the saints of the old covenant cannot surprise us in an epistle that gives such prominence to the fact that the Gentile-Christians were by their very conversion led to the true theocracy and made saints and partakers of its promises (ii. 12 f., 19, comp. i. 4, 13, 18). On the other hand the view that Paul left a gap after *τοῖς ὄντων* or gave such unfilled copies to the bearer, put forward by many older expositors and shared by Bleek, is quite inconceivable. How little ecclesiastical antiquity thought of removing the *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, because the universal character of the epistle did not seem to suit the Church at Ephesus, is shown by the way in which the Synop. Script. Sac. and the Antiochian expositors get rid of this difficulty by the ready assumption that Paul had not yet been in Ephesus when he wrote our epistle. The particular inscription in which *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* does not yet appear, was in existence as early as the time of Tertullian; nor is it wanting in the Codd. that leave these words out.

undoubtedly of a mixed character.² But since Tychicus, who went to Asia Minor with the Colossian Epistle, carried this one also to its readers with the very same instructions (Eph. vi. 21 f., comp. Col. iv. 7 f.), we can only assume that he was further commissioned to visit the Churches of Asia Minor, for the purpose of reading this epistle publicly to them all, and of giving them news respecting the welfare of the Apostle; an assumption not inconsistent with the very general character of the allusions to the state of the readers, as for example in i. 15. Whether the circle of Churches to which his commission applied, was more closely defined by oral instructions, or extended over the whole of Proconsular Asia, we cannot indeed know; but it is certain that Paul regarded them as essentially Gentile-Christian, and not directly founded by himself. That they belonged in the main to Asia Minor, follows from the fact that when the Pauline Epistles were afterwards collected for reading in the Churches and an inscription sought that would apply to all the rest, the name of the metropolis of Asia Minor was prefixed; and in this way the *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* afterwards got into the text also.

² Nevertheless Wurm (*Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1833), Rinck (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1849, 4), Wieseler, Schenkel, and above all Meyer, have adhered to the view that the epistle was specially intended for Ephesus; in which case its universal attitude can only be explained in some very artificial way, since other epistles, abounding in personal matter and references to the circumstances of those addressed, were also personally conveyed. To these untenable hypotheses may be reckoned the view that the epistle was addressed to that portion of the Church converted after the Apostle's departure, as Neudecker maintained (comp. also Köhler); or to a Church in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, only recently founded (Lünemann, *de Epist. quam Paulus ad Eph. dedisse perhibetur authentia*, Gött., 1842; comp. also Harless in his *Kommentar*, 1834). But all these assumptions based on the hypothesis that it was designed for Ephesus in the first place, but ultimately for wider distribution, as adopted by Schrader, Schott, Credner, Neander, Thiersch, Wiggers (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1841) and many others, after the example of Beza and Grotius (comp. also Hofmann, who makes Paul begin his journey at Ephesus and return thither), are excluded by the fact that they hardly remove the chief difficulties.

The hypothesis that our epistle was a circular letter intended for a wider circle of Churches, was first developed by James Ussher (*Annales V. et N. Ti.*, Gen., 1712); and since Eichhorn and Bertholdt, has in recent times become predominant, though with many modifications. But all those hypotheses which, whether retaining the *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* or not, assume that the epistle was designed for Ephesus in the first place at least (comp. note 2), and identify it in any way with the epistle mentioned in Col. iv. 16, must be rejected. That the epistle cannot have been one directly addressed to the Laodiceans, as assumed by Mill and Wetstein after the example of Marcion, as well as by Mangold, following the precedent of many recent expositors (comp. Kamphausen, *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.*, 1866, 4, and on the assumption of its spuriousness Baur, Hitzig, and Volkmar), follows simply from the fact that its destination would in that case have been indicated in the address, as in all the Paulines; and the substitution of *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* would remain inexplicable. Even the view which is in itself possible that it was the circular letter to the Churches of Phrygia (comp. Bleek) or Asia Minor (comp. Anger, *über den Laodicenerbrief*, Leipz., 1843; Kiene, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1869, 2; Klostermann, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1870, 1; but also Reuss, Laurent, L. Schulze, W. Schmidt in Meyer's *Komm.*, 5 Aufl., 1878, and Hofmann) which the Colossians according to iv. 16 received from Laodicea, requires all kinds of artificial supplementary hypotheses; for the same Tychicus who brought the Colossian Epistle was to convey this one also, which according to vi. 21 did not by any means circulate independently; and Tychicus could hardly have made the whole journey round to Laodicea with Onesimus, before taking the Colossian Epistle to its address and Onesimus to his place of destination. Such view is however excluded by the fact that Paul could not have sent greeting to the Laodiceans in the Colossian Epistle (Col. iv. 15), if he were also writing them a letter that was to be carried by the same friend. Against the whole hypothesis comp. Sartori, *über den Laodicenerbrief*, Lübeck, 1853.

2. After the inscription (i. 1 f.) the epistle begins with solemn praise to God who has chosen us before the foundation of the world to spotless holiness as well as to the adoption of children (i. 3-5) and has effected this salvation through redemption by the blood of Christ, as also by making known the mystery of His salvation (i. 6-10), namely to those who through Christ have entered into their expected and predestined inheritance in the Messiah (i. 11 f.), as well as to those to whom, on account of their believing reception

of a gospel of salvation that was new to them, this inheritance was sealed by the Spirit on the day they received it (i. 13 f.).¹ The usual thanksgiving for the Christian state bestowed on them in faith and love (i. 15 f.) then follows, but immediately passes over into the wish that the Spirit might give them to know the whole riches of the hope of salvation imparted to them at their calling and of the power of God to accomplish the same in the saints (i. 17-19). Paul finds the earnest of this partly in the exaltation of Christ to Divine power and glory above all heavenly creatures, and His appointment to be the head of the Church (i. 20-23), partly in the merciful deliverance and awakening from the death of sin to a new life already granted to Gentiles as well as Jews (ii. 1-10). In particular he reminds his Gentile readers that they who had not, like Israel, a hope of salvation founded in the promise, were now admitted to full participation in all the blessings of the theocracy, because the expiatory death of Christ had removed the legal barrier that separated them, and had remodelled the two hostile portions of the pre-Christian world into a new organic whole (ii. 11-19), which, resting on the foundation of the apostolic announcement of Christ, is formed into a habitation of God through the Spirit (ii. 20-22). The petition usually attached to the thanksgiving now rises to a solemn prayer for Gentile Christians offered up by him as the captive Apostle

¹ This very introduction shows that where the subjective realisation of salvation is concerned, chief stress is laid on the knowledge of the Divine mystery of salvation (i. 8 f.) just as in the Colossian Epistle; although i. 13 proves how little the fundamental meaning of faith is thereby prejudiced, showing also that the final purpose of the world in its relation to Christ appears as the highest object of their knowledge (i. 10); to which purpose the election in Him before the foundation of the world corresponds (i. 3). The introduction also touches on the realisation of salvation in the two parts of the pre-Christian world, as is unanswerably proved by the change of *ἡμεῖς* and *ὕμεῖς*, as well as by the recurrence of the *εἰς ἑκατον δόξης αὐτοῦ* in i. 12 and 14, a realisation which, though different in form, is identical in substance.

of the Gentiles, in which capacity he now first fully presents himself to his readers, laying stress on the mystery of the equal title of the Gentiles to salvation specially revealed to him, and on the carrying out of this Divine decree of salvation that was his appointed task (iii. 1-13). This prayer has to do essentially with the completion of their Christian life, treating mainly of the full knowledge of the love of Christ (iii. 14-19), and concluding with a full-toned doxology (iii. 20 f.). The practical part of the epistle begins with an exhortation to make the unity of the Church a reality, its subjective and objective conditions being set forth (iv. 1-6); and then proceeds to explain how the very multiplicity of God's gifts of grace (iv. 7-11) serves solely for the building up of the Church as the body of Christ (iv. 12-16). The Gentile Christians are then reminded that Christianity necessarily involves the laying aside of the old and the putting on of the new man, allusion being made to the sinfulness of their past life (iv. 17-24). The admonitory part now opens out into a varied series of single exhortations, culminating in an admonition to love after the example of Christ (iv. 25-v. 2) and in a most impressive warning against all fellowship with heathen unchastity, avarice and excess (v. 3-20). From this he passes on to the natural conditions of submission, regulating the mutual obligations of husband and wife (v. 21-23), of children to parents (vi. 1-4), slaves to masters (vi. 5-9); finally admonishing them to true Christian warfare against the powers of darkness (vi. 10-18). In conclusion there follows a request for their prayers, a reference to Tychicus for news of his personal welfare, and a benediction the fulness and comprehensive form of which indicate plainly enough the circular character of the epistle (vi. 19-24).

3. It follows from the nature of the subject that an epistle which was despatched with the same messenger as the Colossian one, represents the Apostle as moving essentially in the same circle of thought. Equal importance is attached to

knowledge; here however, as in the Colossian Epistle, it does not consist in theosophic speculations but in the comprehensive knowledge of the Divine purpose of salvation, of the cosmic significance of Christ and the whole work of salvation,¹ of the organic unity of the Church under Christ its Head, and the right ordering of Christian conduct in the most varied conditions and relations of common life. While all pointed polemic is wanting in our epistle, it lays far greater stress on that which forms the foundation of the Church's unity and on what is necessary for its preservation; and the pervading allusion to the removal of the pre-Christian antagonism by the saving work of Christ, and the bringing of the Gentiles to the salvation promised to Israel by means of the gospel with whose service he was entrusted, is peculiarly characteristic of our epistle; whereas in the Colossian one the universality of this gospel is only emphasized in very general terms (but compare Col. iii. 11). Hand in hand with this affinity of thought we find a prevailing similarity of expression, while many of the same termini technici recur in both epistles even apart from such as serve for the expression of thoughts in common, though not without peculiar application and modification in the case of each.² Finally,

¹ This fact is not inconsistent with such knowledge having been apprehended from different aspects in the two epistles. As the cosmic significance of Christ is in the Colossian Epistle founded on his relation to the creation and preservation of the world, so in the Ephesian Epistle it is founded on the decree of election conceived in Him before the foundation of the world and determining creation itself (comp. iii. 9), and in His exaltation above all heavenly powers (compare however Col. ii. 10). While in the former epistle the death of Christ appears as a victory over hostile powers, in the latter the Christian life is depicted as a constant wrestling with these powers; as in the former the true life of the Christian is already in heaven in consequence of death with Christ, so here he who is raised from the death of sin in communion of life with Christ, is already translated to heaven with Christ (Eph. ii. 5 f.). Eph. v. 2 also echoes the typical conception of the O. T. law, and forms the background to Eph. ii. 11.

² Compare the meaning attached to *ἐπίγνωσις* and *σοφία*, as well as to

throughout the whole epistle are to be found reminiscences of detached passages of the Colossian Epistle, in many cases due to the similarity of the subject treated, though frequently employed in quite a different connection, showing, moreover, a very unequal degree of verbal conformity, and often only giving a new and free application to the expression employed in the parallel passage.

In the praise-giving introduction we already find (i. 7) redemption in Christ through the forgiveness of sins, from Col. i. 14, in the thanksgiving a similar mention of *πίστις ἐν Χρ.* and of love to all the saints (i. 15, comp. Col. i. 4), the evidence of the Divine *ἐνέργεια* in the raising up of Christ (i. 19, comp. Col. ii. 12), the awakening from a death of sin to life with Christ (ii. 1, 5, comp. Col. ii. 13); while the thoughts of Col. i. 20-22 only occur in very different colouring in Eph. ii. 15 f. In both epistles Paul represents himself as the minister of the gospel in conformity with a special Divine *οικονομία* (iii. 2, 7, comp. Col. i. 23, 25), according to which the mystery hid from the ages is now revealed to the saints (iii. 5, 10, comp. Col. i. 26). These reminiscences multiply in the practical part, where the admonitions contained in Col. iii. 12 f. appear separately in iv. 2 and 32; where the *ἀγάπη* is connected with the *εἰρήνη* (in a characteristically different way) and with the vocation, as also with the organic unity of the Church (iv. 1-4, comp. Col. iii. 14 f.), whose restoration and growth in Christ as the Head is carried out in a like figure (iv. 15 f., comp. Col. ii. 19); where the new man is said to be created after God or His image (iv. 24, comp. Col. iii. 10), and a similar warning is given against lying and anger in their different manifestations (iv. 25, 31, comp. Col. iii. 8 f.), as well as against the heathen sins of unchastity, uncleanness and covetousness characterized as idolatry, that draw down the wrath of God (v. 3, 5 f., comp. Col. iii. 5 f.). Finally

σύνεσις and *μυστήριον* in the two epistles, also the various connections in which mention is made of the *πλήρωμα* and of the *πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης*. In both are emphasized the sitting of Christ at the right hand of God and His position as *κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος*, the enumeration of the manifold orders of heavenly powers as the *ἐξουσία τοῦ σκοποῦς*, the *ἀποκατάσσειν* and *ἀπαλλοτριῶσθαι*, and the *εἰρήνην ποιεῖν* by the cross; also the old and the new man, the distinction of a *περιτομὴ χειροπολιητος* and *ἀχειροπολιητος*, the mention of the *δύγματα* of the law, the *ἅγιος καὶ ἄμωμος*, the *ἀξίως περιπατεῖν* and the use of the figure of the *σύνδεσμος*; compare the *λόγος ἐν χάριτι*, Col. iv. 6, with the *λόγος*, the *χάρις διδ. τοῖς ἀκούουσιν*, Eph. iv. 29 (comp. *αἰσχρολογία*, Col. iii. 8, with *αἰσχροτῆς ἢ μωρολογία*, Eph. v. 4), the suffering *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐθνῶν*, etc., etc.

the redeeming of the time as a mark of true wisdom in intercourse with non-Christians (Col. iv. 5) recurs in v. 15 f., and Christian fulness of song in connection with thanksgiving to God and with the name of Christ (Col. iii. 16) in v. 19 f. The Christian table of domestic duties is parallel throughout (v. 22-vi. 9, comp. Col. iii. 18-iv. 1), so too is the exhortation to prayer, as to intercession for the Apostle (vi. 18 f., comp. Col. iv. 2 f.); while the announcement of Tychicus is identical in its whole wording (vi. 21 f., comp. with Col. iv. 7 f.).

The question as to which of these two letters that were despatched simultaneously was first written, is quite immaterial. The determining motive with those who adopted the view that the Ephesian Epistle was written first, for example Eichhorn, Hug, Credner, Reuss, Guericke, Anger and others, was mainly that it is already mentioned in Col. iv. 16, which has been at length explicitly stated by W. Schmidt. All arguments drawn from the relation of the parallel passages (comp. Hofmann) are lacking in power of demonstration when once the epistles are ascribed to the same author. The fact that Tychicus travelled first to Colosse as was natural, in order to deliver up Onesimus and the special letter, afterwards setting out on the circuit with the other letter, does not in itself prove that the former was also written first; but the simplest explanation of the *καὶ ὑμεῖς* in Eph. vi. 21, though not a cogent proof, is to be found in the involuntary allusion to the charge also given to Tychicus for Colosse (iv. 7), against which the *καὶ* in Col. iii. 8 manifestly proves nothing. In any case it is most natural to suppose that the epistle designed for concrete needs was written first (comp. Wiggers, Harless, Neander, Bleek, Meyer, Schenkel); wider and freer expression being then given by the Apostle in a letter of more general character to the thoughts by which he was stirred. The parallels of the Ephesian Epistle show, with few exceptions, a greater wealth of expression and a more detailed development of thought, as is clearly shown in the table of domestic duties. Comp. v. Bemmelen, *de Epp. ad Eph. et Coll. inter se coll.*, Lugd. Bat., 1803.

4. De Wette and Ewald in particular who, following Schleiermacher, have denied the authorship of the Ephesian letter to the Apostle and ascribed it to one of his disciples. But the striking incongruity-justly discovered between the general character of the contents of the epistle and its particular address disappears of itself, since the latter has been shown to be spurious (note 1), and would remain just as striking if the pseudonymous author had chosen an address, which, after the Apostle's well-known relation to Ephesus, would necessarily have given offence. Still greater offence was given by the peculiar relation of this epistle to the Colossian one, although the joint despatch of the two epistles, that was unexampled, naturally led to the affinity actually existing, though often exaggerated and erroneously understood.¹ Nevertheless the relation to the Colossian Epistle remains a decisive test for the criticism of the Ephesian one, for however able and independent the imitation of which it consists, the dependence of the latter would necessarily betray itself in unmistakable signs. That this is not the case is abundantly shown by the history of criticism. After Mayerhoff, by a detailed comparison of the parallels, had endeavoured to prove the dependence of the Colossian Epistle throughout, Hönig (*Zeitschr. für wiss.*

¹ The fact that the Roman Epistle, written more than three years after that to the Galatians, presents the most striking parallels with it (iii. 20, comp. Gal. ii. 16; iv. 3, comp. Gal. iii. 6; i. 17, comp. Gal. iii. 11; x. 5, comp. Gal. iii. 12; iv. 14, comp. Gal. iii. 18; viii. 15, 17, comp. Gal. iv. 6 f.; viii. 14, vi. 14, comp. Gal. v. 18) has been generally overlooked. On the other hand there is little probability that one who desired to write in the name of Paul, and was in many respects able to imitate the Pauline mode of teaching and expression so well, even when writing independently, should by the fiction contained in vi. 21 f., have created the possibility of so close a relation to the Colossian Epistle, although it offered most imperfect points of connection for the greater and more important part of what he had to say, especially as such attachment would be more likely to give offence than to lend the appearance of genuineness to his composition.

Theol., 1872, 1), following in the footsteps of de Wette, thought he could succeed in proving the very same thing of the Ephesian Epistle. It was on the observation of the signs of dependence and originality running through both that Holtzmann based his attempt to explain the Ephesian Epistle, as a copy of the genuine Colossian one, and to ascribe the interpolations of the latter to the *Autor ad Ephesios* (§ 24, 6); although in these at least we have not a copy but an expansion from the same hand, viz. the very same problem presented by the two epistles on the supposition of their genuineness. Hence, v. Soden found it an easy task to prove that in none of these passages could there be any thought of a dependence on the part of the Colossian Epistle (comp. § 24, 6).² That the epistle in its doctrine and expression contains much that is peculiar as compared with the older Paulines, is incontestable; but if once the Colossian Epistle be regarded as genuine, an advance of Paulinism in both these respects must be conceded; which explains the Ephesian Epistle just as well as the Colossian one. Besides that which is common to both, each has something peculiar to itself (comp. esp. Holtzmann in his *Einl.*), like every Pauline epistle: and the fact that the Ephesian Epistle, which contains no manner of polemic or argumentation, but in its doctrinal part is an outpouring of the Apostle respecting the glory of the work of redemption clothed in the form of thanksgiving and intercession, and in its admoni-

² But it is just as easy for the very same reasons to prove in opposition to him that the alleged signs of dependence on the part of the Ephesian Epistle likewise disappear on a more impartial exegesis. The most careful examination of the parallel passages invariably leads to the conclusion that the appearance of dependence, found sometimes in one and sometimes in the other, is nothing but appearance, and is dispelled by a more careful estimate of the connection and aim of each individual parallel; as also that the peculiar relation of affinity between the two epistles is explicable only on the assumption that they are both independent but contemporaneous compositions of the same author.

tory part a general discussion of morals without direct reference to definite needs, is distinguished from the older Paulines by the breadth, freshness and spontaneity of its delineation, is the less striking, since the Colossian Epistle forms the connecting link between it and them in this respect (against de Wette compare also Lünemann, *de Ep. quam Paulus ad Eph. ded. perh.*, Gött., 1842).

5. The Tübingen criticism, this time led by Schwegler in the *Theolog. Jahrb.* (1844), and carried on in the same periodical by Plank and Köstlin (1847, 1850), was apparently in a far more favourable position, inasmuch as it put both epistles together into the Gnostic movement of the time, and accordingly gave a Gnostic interpretation to the strong emphasis laid on the *γῶσις* and *σοφία*, the antithesis of light and darkness, as well as the conceptions of *μυστήριον* and *πλήρωμα*; finding a Gnostic syzygy in Christ's relation to the Church, and in the *αἰῶνες*, the Gnostic æons, of which the *πολυποίκιλος σοφία* was said even to point to the fantastic changes of the Valentinian æon. Baur also discovered echoes of Montanism on which Schwegler laid special stress; as for example the prominence given to the *πνεῦμα* as the Montanist Paraclete and the gift of the Spirit, the union of prophets with apostles, the insistence on the holiness of the Church and the division of its life into epochs, as well as the comparison of its relation to Christ with the marriage-relation, and such like.¹ The proper aim of the epistle seemed to be to bring the two parties in the Church, viz. the Jewish and Gentile Christians who were still separated, into the unity of the Catholic Church; which was attempted by an external synthesis of faith and love, by modifying the

¹ It is obvious that here the simplest apostolic representations and chains of thought are conceived in the light of a later time which is altogether foreign to them, in order by arguing in a circle to prove that the epistle belonged to this time; on which account it is possible for the relation of Christ to the Church or the passage iv. 7-11 to be interpreted Gnostically by one and Montanistically by others.

Pauline thesis of justification and making concessions to Judaism with its righteousness of works, and by an external union of Jews and Gentiles through the abolition of the law, *i.e.* essentially of circumcision.² The standpoint of the Tübingen school is adhered to by Hilgenfeld, who ascribes our epistle to an Asiatic Pauline disciple of the Gnostic time and holds that it is a free revision of the Colossian Epistle, written about 140 (comp. Volkmar and Hausrath). Pfeiderer too lays strong emphasis on the fact that the Ephesian Epistle represents a phase of advanced Paulinism essentially distinct from that of the Colossian Epistle, tending in the direction of the Johannine theology; and maintains that it was written by a Jewish Christian who aimed at mediating all party-antagonisms in the universal Church, in opposition to practical libertinism and dogmatic hyper-Paulinism, whose speculations abandoned the ground of sound morality and historical Christianity and perhaps directly tended to separation from the Jewish Christian portion of the Church. On the other hand Holtzman, whom Mangold is disposed to follow, has again gone back to the close of the first and beginning of the second centuries, thus withdrawing the epistle entirely from the time of the Gnostic movement, and making the *Autor ad Ephesios* once more an immediate disciple of the Apostle. But this does away with

² It is just as clear that a one-sided conception of older Paulinism as well as a misapprehension of the historical motive which effected its advancement even on the side of fundamental ethics, lies at the foundation of this view. While Baur was inclined to ascribe both epistles to one author who reserved all polemic and individual matter for the Colossian Epistle but expanded its contents in the larger one, whereas Schwegler looked upon the Ephesian Epistle as a remodelling of the Colossian one from a more developed dogmatic standpoint and under more developed ecclesiastical relations, the Tübingen criticism did not even arrive at a certain solution of the relationship between the two; with which the older criticism was so prominently occupied (comp. against this criticism Klöpffer, *de Orig. Epp. ad Eph. et Col.*, Gryph., 1852).

every certain rule by which to determine whether the relations that brought about this development of Paulinism were not already present in the Pauline time and effected in the person of Paul himself.³

6. Even assuming the genuineness of the Ephesian Epistle, no satisfactory explanation has been given of its historical occasion; indeed it has been hardly attempted. The spread of Jewish-Christian theosophy beyond the circle of the Phrygian Churches cannot be proved; and the complete absence of all polemic and warning against it forbids the assumption that the epistle was intended to obviate such danger. Hence, as de Wette already perceived, the true leading motive of the epistle still consists in an exhortation to church-unity. This forms the starting-point and climax of the practical part; and to it the doctrinal part evidently leads up, inasmuch as it always goes back to the removal of the pre-Christian antagonism in the Church.¹ But

³ Mangold lays the principal stress on iii. 5 f. where the holy apostles and prophets are mentioned, and full insight into the equal privileges of the Gentiles and Jews is said to be ascribed to the primitive apostles. A much more significant mark of a later time would be iv. 11, if the leaders of the Church were here designated at the same time as teachers. But either those working in the separate Churches are here comprehended under one category as contrasted with the gift-bearers given for the benefit of the whole Church, or the image of the *ποιμένες* does not indicate, as in Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 2, the rulers of the Church, but Church-pastors in a spiritual sense (comp. John x. 9 f.).

¹ The older introduction-writers, as Michaelis, Hänlein, Schott, and Neudecker, speak, it is true, of Ephesian errorists also, but iv. 14 is sufficiently explained by the experiences Paul had just made in the Phrygian Churches; and v. 6 refers to moral seduction. But when the hypothesis of the spurious character of the epistle is made to rest upon the union-tendency that makes it refer to a post-apostolic age, the fact that no trace of any parties representing different conceptions of Christian truth appears in our epistle is overlooked, as also that the abrogation of the law as a rule of salvation and life (ii. 15) is truly Pauline; while the pervading demand for moral attestation of the Christian state is no concession to Jewish righteousness of works; whereas the unity here required is not based on concessions that one party was to make to the other, but on the consideration as to how the Gentiles were to be actually

since the epistle pre-supposes Gentile-Christian readers throughout, such exhortation, though manifestly based on the assumption of a distinction between Gentile and Jewish Christian Churches or members of Churches, is wanting in all historical motive, so long as we adhere to the view that the Christianizing of Asia Minor is attributable solely to Paul, and therefore that the Churches of that district were essentially Gentile-Christian. But just as we have already shown that the disturbances in Galatia could only be accounted for on the assumption that Jewish-Christian, primitive-apostolic Church-foundations had existed there from early times (§ 18, 1), so too the Ephesian Epistle can only be understood if we remember that, according to 1 Peter i. 1, such foundations must also have been present in the Churches of pro-consular Asia to which it was addressed (§ 15, 2, comp. also § 35, 2). The Phrygian disturbances had again reminded the Apostle how readily the old antagonism which he had overcome in his legally-minded Pharisaic opponents might spring up again in a new form (§ 24, 3); hence it occurred to him to show that it might be got rid of by admitting the Gentiles to the possession of the salvation and the promises of free Israel, and must necessarily be dissipated on the part of the Gentiles by the laying aside of all heathen practices and the regulation of the whole moral life in a Christian spirit which makes all legal or ascetic restrictions superfluous. The similarity the Ephesian Epistle bears to the Roman one in this respect is obvious. In both Paul turns as the Gentile apostle to Gentile-Christian Churches which he himself had not directly founded; in both his argument is called forth not by errors present in the Churches, but by the experiences he had made in the struggle with a Jewish-Christian antagonism (as

received into community of salvation with Israel, and thereby all antagonism threatening the unity of the Church and arising out of its pre-Christian past, be removed.

formerly with legal Pharisaism, so now with theosophic asceticism); in both Christianity is set forth as the religion of the world that would remove the pre-Christian antagonism while fully recognising Israel's historical prerogative of salvation and the abiding typical significance of the law, on which he now for the first time lays greater stress. Here, where the Jewish Christianity against which he had to contend in Phrygia no longer went back to the Scriptures, Paul thought it unnecessary to bring forward Scripture proof on his side. And if the final aim of the Roman Epistle lay in the importance that Paul attached to the Church of Rome as the metropolis of Gentile Christianity, it consisted in the Ephesian Epistle in the distinction still present in Asia Minor, between the Pauline-Gentile-Christian and primitive-apostolic-Jewish-Christian Church-foundations. Under these circumstances it will not appear strange that the highly-esteemed Petrine Epistle current in the Jewish-Christian Churches of Asia Minor, and with which according to § 23, 6 the Apostle was acquainted, should have been constantly in his mind in writing this epistle, or even that he should have designedly followed it in many respects; a fact which would also explain a reference to the other apostles (iii. 5, comp. No. 5, note 3).

The relation of affinity between the first Epistle of Peter and the Epistle to the Ephesians was very early perceived, and cannot be weakened by the fact that occasional echoes of the former are also found in the Colossian Epistle which was written contemporaneously with that to the Ephesians, and during whose composition therefore he was equally well acquainted with it. Holtzman has certainly attempted by a detailed comparison of parallels to establish the priority of the Ephesian Epistle, formerly accepted as self-evident; but Ewald, Schwegler, Hilgenfeld (comp. *Zeitschr. f. w. Theol.*, 1873, 4), Pfeiderer and Hönig have acknowledged the priority of Peter's epistle, maintaining however that the Ephesian one is spurious. It is a fact that the Ephesian Epistle is the only one among the Paulines that, like 1 Peter, has the form of a circular letter; just as it is the only one that like it begins by praising God (in a form quite similar) for the blessings of salvation bestowed in Christ,

though afterwards returning to the Pauline manner of thanksgiving (i. 15 ff.). In it the exhortation enters into the special regulation of domestic life with its duties and obligations as in Peter's epistle, and like it concludes with an exhortation to wage war against the *διάβολος* (a term that Paul nowhere else applies to the devil: 1 Pet. v. 8 f., comp. Eph. vi. 11-18); and even the unique *εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς* in the final benediction (vi. 23) recalls 1 Pet. v. 14. To this may be added a number of striking detached reminiscences running through the whole epistle.² That an intentional dependence of this kind on an older apostolic writing, calculated to show the Jewish Christians of Asia Minor that the Gentile Christians were instructed in the same truth with themselves, did not prejudice the originality and wealth of the Pauline intellect, is clear enough, even though the traditional view cannot become reconciled to it, while critics like Holtzman reject it as "sheer nonsense." Comp. Weiss, *Petr. Lehrbegr.*, Berlin, 1855, V., 5.

7. The time of the captivity in Cæsarea during which the three epistles to Asia Minor were written, cannot be deter-

It is remarkable that the introductory praise begins with the election to holiness founded in Christ before the world (i. 4), while the Epistle of Peter (i. 2) addresses itself to the *ἐκλεκτοὶ ἐν ἀγιασμῷ*, making use of the same expression, one that occurs nowhere else in Paul, and speaks of Christ in i. 20 as having been foreordained *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*. The hope of the *κληρονομία*, for whose attainment the readers are referred to the power of God (i. 19 f.) reminds us of 1 Pet. i. 3-5; the union of the resurrection and ascension with the subjection of all the heavenly powers (i. 20 ff.) recalls 1 Pet. iii. 22; while the description of the pre-Christian walk of the Jews (ii. 3) puts us in mind of 1 Pet. i. 14 f., especially as the desires here referred to (ii. 11) are called *σαρκικαί*. Only in our epistle is there any mention of *προσαγωγή* to God (ii. 18, comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18); here alone is Christ called the corner-stone (ii. 20) in accordance with an image drawn by Peter (ii. 6 f.) from the Old Testament. The consideration of prophecy from the standpoint of fulfilment (iii. 5) is based entirely on the view developed in 1 Pet. i. 10-12, where mention is also made, as in iii. 10, of the contemplative participation of angels in the work of redemption; even the characterization of all gifts as designed *εἰς ἔργον διακονίας* (iv. 12) reminds us more of 1 Pet. iv. 10, than of similar Pauline sayings. It is remarkable enough that here only are *ποιμένες* specified among the bearers of gifts (iv. 11, comp. 1 Pet. v. 2). With the *εὐσπλαγχνος* in iv. 38, that occurs here only, compare 1 Pet. iii. 8; with the wider conception, of the *εἰδωλοπαρεία* in v. 5 comp. 1 Pet. iv. 3. Domestic duties are regarded in the light of the *ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλληλοῖς*, just as in Peter (v. 21, comp. 1 Pet. ii. 18; iii. 1; v. 5), and the *ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ* (comp. also vi. 5) recalls 1 Pet. ii. 18; iii. 2 (comp. the *ἰδίους ἀνδράσων* v. 22 with 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5).

mined, but the confidence expressed by the Apostle (Philem. v. 22) points to a comparatively early time, before it had become evident that the procurator was delaying his case on the ground of hopes which Paul could not fulfil. At last, when Felix was recalled and Porcius Festus took his place, a decision seemed imminent (Acts xxiv. 27);¹ but when Festus presented himself at Jerusalem immediately after entering upon his office, the hierarchs besieged him with entreaties to give Paul back to them as his lawful judges; wherefore he summoned them to Cæsarea. When, however, the negotiations there having led to no result, the prefect tried to persuade the Apostle to appear before his judges at Jerusalem, Paul found himself compelled to appeal to the Emperor; and after taking counsel with his lawyers, Festus accepted the appeal (xxv. 1-12). But since he had to give the Emperor an account of the prisoner sent up to him for trial, for the purpose of getting advice in this matter to which he was himself a stranger, he turned to King Agrippa, who with his sister Berenice was at that very time waiting upon the new procurator in Cæsarea. At Agrippa's desire the Apostle once more defended himself before him, after which Agrippa declared that if Paul had not appealed, there would have been nothing to prevent his being set free (xxv. 13-xxvi. 32).

¹ We cannot determine the chronological date of this entrance of Festus into office with sufficient accuracy to make it a guide for the life of Paul. It is certain that Felix on his arrival in Rome only escaped being accused by the Jews through the intercession of his brother Pallas, who was poisoned by Nero in 62. Festus therefore cannot have entered upon his office later than the year 61, and it must have been in the summer since Paul began his sea journey in the same autumn, so that according to the usual computation which puts his arrest at or about Whitsuntide of the year 59, just two years remain for his imprisonment under Felix. But Winer, Anger, Wieseler and Schürer are for the year 60, which only affords fresh illustration of the uncertainty of the whole previous chronology. None of the reasons alleged for deciding between these two years has any decisive significance; while some have even wished to go beyond the year 60 (comp. Lehmann and Laurent in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1858, 2; 1864, 3).

At the next opportunity of embarking, the Apostle was therefore assigned to a transport with other prisoners, under the command of a centurion named Julius. Aristarchus and Lucas were permitted to accompany him. But the ship of Adramyttium on which they had embarked, only went as far as Myra in Lycia, where they entered an Alexandrian vessel that was intended for carrying wheat to Italy. Owing to contrary winds much time was lost; and they were obliged to decide on wintering in Crete. But when the people of the ship, hoping to find a better harbour than that into which they had first put again ventured out, they were overtaken by a storm and cast into the open sea. For fourteen days they were tossed on the Adriatic in the greatest peril, until the ship stranded at Malta. The whole crew was saved (Acts xxvii., comp. James Smith, *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 2nd edit., London, 1856). There they passed the three winter months, until an Alexandrian ship took them by Syracuse to Puteoli, where they remained seven days, being entertained by Christian brethren (xxviii. 1-14). The fact that deputations from the Church of Rome, whither one of Paul's companions had probably gone on to announce the Apostle's arrival, went out to the Via Appia to meet the advancing conveyance, greeting him already at the Forum Appii, and afterwards, doubtless in greater number at the Tres tabernæ (xxviii. 15), only proves how fully the Roman Epistle had attained its object. In Rome the prisoner was permitted to occupy a private dwelling, where, although chained to the soldiers who guarded him, he was able throughout the two years of his captivity to preach the Gospel to all who visited him (xxviii. 16, 30 f.),² no man forbidding him.

² Those who make Festus enter upon his office in the year 60 (Note 1) have in many ways found in the words *ὁ ἑκατοντάρχος παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῳ* (xxviii. 16) a proof that at that time Burrus was sole præfectus prætorio, while before and after him there were two

§ 26. THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

1. The Apostle's epistle to the Philippians dates from the time of his captivity at Rome, comparatively from the later part of it, as shown by the many experiences he had already made in that city. He was still in bonds (Phil. i. 7, 13 f., 17), but hoped with great confidence for a speedy decision in his favour (i. 25, ii. 23 f.) although he was prepared for martyrdom (ii. 17 f.).¹ For his part, he scarcely knew which he would prefer; since the longing for his heavenly home was only counterbalanced by anxiety for his Churches (i. 20-24). In any case he looked forward to the future with joyful courage; which did not however prevent his being weary of long confinement. We hear nothing more of a desire for newer and wider activity than his imprisonment offered, such as he so strongly expressed even in

prefects; and therefore that Paul must have already come to Rome in the spring of 61, since Burrus died in the spring of 62. But these words are probably spurious; and even if genuine could only denote the prefect actually in office; and in any case Paul may have arrived in Rome just before the death of Burrus. He cannot have arrived later than the spring of the year 62 (according to Note 1). As to what delayed his trial there for so long, although, to judge by the way in which he was treated, the account given by Festus must evidently have made a good impression, we are absolutely without knowledge.

¹ After Oeder had transferred the Epistle to Corinth in a *Progr.* (Ansbach, 1731), Boettger in his *Beiträge* (1837) following the example of Paulus (*de Tempore ad Phil. Ep.*, 1799) endeavoured to show that the Apostle could only have been a prisoner in Rome from 3-5 days, according to Roman jurisdiction, and consequently that this epistle too must have been written in Cæsarea. He was followed only by Thiersch. The mention of the Pretorium, i.e. the Pretorian camp, as well as of the *oikta τοῦ Καίσαρος* (i. 13; iv. 12) obviously points to Rome, where alone Paul had to expect a decision of life and death, which he could put off everywhere else by an appeal to Rome. Even those who erroneously transfer the Colossian and Ephesian Epistles to Rome, mostly regard our epistle as the later written, although Bleek holds this to be doubtful. But Hofmann's assumption that Paul's condition had taken a decisive turn inasmuch as he was already transferred from the hired lodging to the Pretorium, and therefore that his cause had advanced to a judicial decision, cannot be sustained by i. 13.

Cæsarea (Col. iv. 3; Eph. vi. 19); he only longed after his Churches that were in such constant need of encouragement (Phil. i. 24 ff., ii. 24), while many whom he had once hoped to gain he was now obliged with tears to leave to their fate (iii. 18 f.). It came to pass that Paul saw the former wish of his heart to have fruit in the metropolis (Rom. i. 13) fulfilled to a degree that the dark dispensation by which he had come to Rome not as the victorious conqueror of the world in the service of the gospel but in chains and bonds, had never allowed him to hope. News of the strange prisoner who suffered bondage year after year for the sake of a new gospel of salvation had been spread through the whole barracks by the soldiers of the Pretorian guard who were alternately charged with his custody; and had thence penetrated to circles of the metropolis that had never heard of Christianity before; adherents were gained even in the Emperor's palace (Phil. i. 12 f., iv. 22). Moreover his captivity in Rome tended not a little to stimulate the brethren there in making known the gospel; for apart from the encouraging example afforded by his own irrepressible joy in confessing it, it became more and more evident that no valid accusation could be brought against the evangelical message for which he was in bonds. The Apostle did not indeed conceal from himself the fact that the zeal he excited for the work of evangelization did not invariably proceed from pure motives. It was evident that those who had hitherto played the most prominent part in the Church, and had formerly welcomed the Apostle with joy when he had come presumably for a short stay, now felt injured by the fact that in spite of his imprisonment he formed the true centre of the Church. Their chief concern was by their own redoubled activity to outdo him in the influence which they envied him; and by invidious criticism of his person and work to depreciate his authority in their own favour. But if they thought by this means to

make the captive painfully aware of their superiority, they little knew the Apostle's unselfish interest in the cause of Christ (i. 14-17).² Nor had he any lack of brethren who adhered faithfully to him (iv. 21).³ He frequently suffered from want of earthly goods; but he was accustomed to this, and did not feel it (iv. 11 ff.). Nothing had power to disturb the joy that filled him on account of the visible advance of God's work, or the deep peace of mind with which he awaited the determination of his fate.

2. It was a joyful surprise for the Apostle when an unexpected gift arrived from his beloved Philippians, who had again refused to let themselves be relieved of care for the bodily needs of their Apostle (iv. 10). But a mere remittance of money was not all; the Church had commissioned one of their best men, Epaphroditus, to convey the gift personally, and by his presence with the Apostle to represent them all (ii. 25-30). What the ambassador told him of the Church could only increase his tender love for those whom he calls his joy and crown (iv. 1). He emphatically states that in thinking of them he is filled only with joy and gratitude toward God, with the tenderest

² This is generally supposed to refer to Judaistic teachers in Rome, whose appearance is made an argument for the still strongly Jewish-Christian character of the Roman Church (§ 22, 3). But the way in which Paul unreservedly gives expression to his joy respecting this accession of preaching (i. 18), makes it quite inconceivable that these personal opponents should have preached a gospel in any way differing from that which he preached, as has very justly been acknowledged, in the face of all attempts to obscure the fact by the latest opponent of the epistle (Holsten), and conceded by its latest defender (P. Schmidt). But if it is thus established that they preached the Pauline gospel, there is no further reason for regarding them as Jewish-Christians.

³ ii. 20 has often been erroneously interpreted as a complaint on Paul's part of his isolation. He only says that all are not so unselfish as his Timothy, who served him with filial love and was ready to sacrifice himself in the performance of any commission (ii. 21 f.). It can scarcely be supposed that Aristarchus and Lucas were still with him, for he sends no greeting from them, and they would hardly come under the judgment expressed in ii. 20 f.

love and yearning toward each and all (i. 3 f., 7 f.); recalling how they had remained the same in their fellowship in the gospel from the first day until now, when they gave new proof of it in their gift (i. 5-7), and how they had always been obedient (ii. 12); so that he could only expect good of them in the future (i. 6; ii. 19; iii. 15).

Nevertheless the older criticism, led astray by a misinterpretation of the third chapter originating as early as the Patristic time, supposed that this Church too had been thrown into confusion by Judaistic errorists. Since Eichhorn and Storr, the view of a Jewish-Christian schism in the Church has been adopted, its description being more and more highly coloured, until Rheinwald in his Commentary (1827) went so far as to assume that the Church was at last threatened with complete destruction owing to the split between Jewish and Gentile Christians. This conception was indeed somewhat modified by Schott, Neander, and Guericke; but it was Schinz (*Die Christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi*, Zurich, 1833) who first pointed out its entire incompatibility with the Gentile-Christian character of the Church and all the utterances of the Apostle respecting it.¹ On the other hand, most modern introduction-writers and commentators, following his example, have abandoned the theory of a doctrinal antagonism, and adopted the view that the Church was imperilled by personal dissensions called forth by the arrogant boast of their own privileges and jealous depreciation of the merits of others. But we have no warrant whatever for inferring from the deep psychological foundation of the exhortation to Christian virtue, the existence of opposite errors; the image of the Church thus presented is no less inconsistent with the praise lavished on the whole Church, than that attacked by Schinz; and the mention of a single quarrel between two women (iv. 2 f.) is manifestly no reason for concluding that the whole Church suffered from similar faults, but the reverse. After the praise bestowed on the Church it is quite inconceivable that

¹ It has nevertheless cropped up again in recent times, Holsten, the opponent of the epistle, and P. Schmidt its defender, having again asserted the mixed character of the Church, whose divided faith caused a severe strain between the two parties, symbolized even in the view of so intelligent a critic as Holsten, by the two female names in iv. 2. This antagonism, however, is no longer referred to the alleged Judaistic errorists of the third chapter, but is evolved from the emphasizing of the πάντες and the entirely misinterpreted κοινωνία (i. 5), as well as from i. 27, ii. 2 ff.; while Mangold even goes back completely to the older view, making the πάντες (i. 3, 7) manifestly untrue.

iv. 18 f. should refer to pretended Christians living in immorality, who however, to judge from the context, could only be found in Philippi.

Doubtless it was not alone the need of thanking the Church for the gift he had received that moved the Apostle to write them a letter. He desires to send Timothy that he might be refreshed by a good account of them (ii. 19). He cannot therefore have been free from anxiety concerning them, notwithstanding all that is said in their praise. But the chief cause of this anxiety was unquestionably, as in Thessalonica (comp. 2 Thess. i. 4 f. with Phil. i. 28 f.), the external pressure put upon the Church by their still unbelieving countrymen. The flourishing Macedonian Churches appear specially to have incurred such enmity from them (comp. also ii. 15 f.). Not that Paul feared that the Church would be led into apostasy by this means; but it lay like a heavy weight on them; and the fact that their Apostle had lain for years in chains and bonds as if forsaken by God, contributed not a little to their increasing sensitiveness. True joy in believing was the goal to which the progress desired on their behalf was to lead (i. 25); Paul again and again exhorts to Christian joy which overcomes all murmurings and doubts (ii. 14-18), which rests in Christ as the sole foundation (iii. 1) and casts all care upon God (iv. 4 ff.). But knowing that union makes strength (i. 27), he emphatically exhorts to unanimity which is maintained only by unselfish humility (ii. 2 ff.). It is not love in which the Church is wanting and which he supplicates on their behalf, but a right understanding of the way in which love becomes fruitful in its effects (i. 9 ff.). He has no particular fault to censure; but in earnest Christian wrestling for salvation (ii. 12 f.), in constant striving towards the goal (iii. 15 f.), in joy in the beautiful tasks set them in evangelical preaching (iv. 8 f.), they are to overcome the spirit of despondency that weighs them down, and anxiety for the future under all menaces of the present. Such is

the aim of this Epistle de gaudio, as it has so often since Bengel been called with justice.

3. From the inscription of the epistle we see that the Church at Philippi had already bishops and deacons; whether from the beginning or not, we do not know. The reason of their being expressly included in the introductory greeting (i. 1 f.) is probably to be found in the fact that they had suggested the offering of love to Paul, and been instrumental in carrying it out. In none of his epistles does he give such emphatic expression to his gratitude toward God, his confidence in their further progress, and his tender love for his readers, to which he attaches the usual form of intercession on their behalf (i. 3-11). He then proceeds in the first place to allay their anxiety respecting him. Hitherto his imprisonment had tended greatly to the furtherance of the gospel, which is a continual source of joy to him (i. 12-18). In any case he looks forward with joy and confidence to the decision respecting his fate; but is firmly convinced that it will prove to their advantage (i. 19-26). It lies with them, by steadfastness in the fight of faith without (i. 27-30), and by that union which has its root in self-denying humility and of which Christ had set them an example (ii. 1-11), not only to work out the salvation of their own souls, but also to increase and share his joy (ii. 12-18). The very form in which he clothes his exhortation shows how far it was from being directed to the reform of serious evil in the Church. It is for their consolation and in order to be quickened by fresh news of them that he desires to send Timothy to them, as soon as he can learn the issue of his trial. He gives his reasons for choosing Timothy for this mission; and promises to follow in person as speedily as possible (ii. 19-24). But the Church was also in great anxiety concerning Epaphroditus, who, having fallen sick on the way, had allowed himself no rest, that he might carry

out the charge with which the Apostle had entrusted him; and had by this means been in the greatest danger of losing his life. After his recovery he seems to have been so homesick, that the Apostle preferred to do without the faithful representative of his favourite Church rather than leave the Philippians any longer in anxiety respecting him, or witness his longing for home. He therefore sent him back with the letter; and while with the most charming delicacy he makes it appear as if his first object were to relieve himself of all care, he prepares a good reception for the delegate, who had in truth but half fulfilled his mission (ii. 25-30). It is not till now that the Apostle comes to the leading exhortation to true Christian joy, which however is in essence the keynote that runs through all the previous part (iii. 1). He begins by unfolding the true and only ground of this joy in opposition to unbelieving Judaism, showing from his own experience how he regarded all the carnal gains and privileges of the latter as loss, for the sake of Christ and the salvation given in Him (iii. 2-11). He does not mean to say that he has already reached the goal of the full appropriation of Christ as this highest good, for Christian perfection can only consist in constant striving after it, and in the right use of that which is already attained (iii. 12-16). Finally by drawing an adverse picture of the enemies of the cross of Christ who seek their joy and glory in the shameful lusts of the earth, he shows how we have in Christ the earnest of a glorious hope that promises the highest transfiguration even of our material bodies (iii. 17-iv. 1).¹ In conclusion he admon-

¹ Expositors have so little understood the transition in iii. 1, that it has been taken for an allusion to former epistles (comp. Bleek, Holsten, and P. Schmidt); or even, as Paulus in the *Heidelberger Jahrb.*, 1872, 7, held, for the beginning for a new epistle, perhaps to more intimate friends of the Apostle or to officers of the Church (comp. Krause, *An Ep. ad Phil. in Duas Ep. Discerp. sit*, Regiom., 1811). Ewald regarded iii. 1-iv. 1, and iv. 2 ff. as two distinct supplements; and Hausrath holds that our epistle was made up of two separate ones. That the

ishes two women, who with Clement and his fellow-labourers had formerly rendered good service to the mission, to be at peace; and begs their true yokefellows to help them in this respect (iv. 2 f.). Once again however, he exhorts all to have true Christian joy and to strive after Christian virtue (iv. 4-9). Not till then does he thank them for the gift they had sent him, which indeed he did not require but in which for their sakes he rejoiced; because they had thus remained true to themselves and would receive the reward he promised them from God (iv. 10-20). Through the rulers of the Church to whom the epistle was delivered, he sends greeting to each one as in 1 Thess. v. 26; salutes them from those by whom he is immediately surrounded as well as from the whole Roman Church, especially the members of the Imperial household, and concludes with the benediction (iv. 21-23).

4. After Schrader had led the way by throwing doubt on section iii. 1-iv. 9, the Tübingen school declared the Philippian Epistle along with the rest of the Captivity Epistles, to be spurious. According to Baur, it too moved in the circle of Gnostic ideas and expressions; ii. 6 in particular only finding its explanation in a reference to the history of the Valentinian Sophia.¹ Plank and Köstlin

first half of chap. iii. refers not to Jewish-Christian opponents but to Judaism, is now universally admitted; although Mangold again opposes it; the second half on the other hand is sometimes made to refer to Jewish-Christians, and at other times to nominal Christians who were living in immorality. But the enemies of the cross of Christ who practise idolatry with shameful sensual indulgence can only be heathen (comp. the *ἀντικελευμένοι* in i. 28 and the epithet unclean *κόρες* in iii. 2), of whom Paul formerly hoped that they might be won over to Christianity, but whom he can now only with deep sorrow characterize as ripe for destruction. Exegesis is fundamentally at fault in regarding vers. 2 as a warning and making it refer to the same people, while the wording compels us to think of others in whom Paul wishes to exemplify the antithesis of the *χαλρεῖν ἐν κυρίῳ*.

¹ Compare his dispute with Ernesti on this subject (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1848, 4; 1851, 3) in the *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849, 4; 1852, 2. Baur was

(*Theolog. Jahrb.*, 1847, 50) also endeavoured to prove that the justification-theory of the epistle and its attitude toward the legal economy was no longer genuinely Pauline, and to carry out Baur's hints on this point. But Baur had already described the proper aim of the composition as conciliatory. He unhesitatingly identified the Philippian Clement mentioned in iv. 3 with the Flavius Clement executed under Domitian by combining this passage with iv. 22; and in the fact that this genuine Petrine disciple of the Clementine tradition was raised to be a fellow-worker with Paul, he found a confirmation of such tendency. According to Schwegler the allusion to the hostile attitude with respect to Paul assumed by the Roman Judaists (i. 15 f.; iii. 2 f.) also serves the same tendency; though it is hard to understand how the pseudonymous writer could make his Paul judge them so leniently at one time and so harshly at another; a thing that occurs nowhere else (i. 18; iii. 2). Following a hint thrown out by Baur he first metamorphosed the two women in iv. 2 into the two opposing Christian parties, whom Paul, appealing to his *σύζυγος*, i.e. Peter, exhorts to union; a thought afterwards spun out by Volkmar still more fancifully (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1856, 1857). This criticism was at once opposed not only by Ernesti and Lünemann (*Pli. ad Philipp. Ep.*, Gött., 1847), but also by Brückner (*Ep. ad Phil.*, Lips., 1848), Grimm (in the *Theol. Literaturbibl.*, 1850, 51), and especially Weiss in his *Kommentar*, 1859; but after the genuineness of the epistle had been energetically defended even by Hilgenfeld, the later critical school (Hausrath, Holtzmann, Schenkel, Pfeleiderer,

absolutely incapable of rightly estimating the epistle, which certainly does not bear the character of the great doctrinal and polemic epistles throughout; everywhere he found monotonous repetitions, want of connection, poverty of thought, weak imitation of older epistles, prominence given to the person of the Apostle in the interest of a tendency, and above all no fully explained motive.

comp. also Weiffenbach, *zur Ausleg. v. Phil.* ii. 5-11, Leipz., 1884, and others) followed suit; and the Philippian Epistle might for a long time have been regarded as a position abandoned by criticism.

It is in fact hard to understand how an epistle containing so little that is properly doctrinal, and for the forging of which no object whatever can be conceived, should be spurious. The purely personal outpourings of the Apostle's heart respecting his feelings towards the Philippians, his frame of mind and prospects in captivity, would appear to be entirely at variance with such a view; especially does it seem inconceivable that a pseudonymous writer should have put into the mouth of the Apostle the expectation of being set free, although such expectation by the assumption of criticism was not actually fulfilled. On what theory could the discussions respecting the sending of Timothy, that seem to condemn all other fellow-workers of the Apostle in an unheard-of way, be explained, or the sending back of Epaphroditus; especially as they presuppose entirely concrete details, for whose invention there could have been no possible motive? The passionate polemic against the alleged Jewish-Christians of chap. iii., transcending all measure and moderation, would in that case be unintelligible; and though certainly forming the true point of the whole composition, would be in glaring conflict with its pacific aim. The personal matter in the conclusion (iv. 2 f., 22) could however, if pseudonymous, only be explained by an exegesis that could hardly be taken seriously; the constantly recurring exhortations to Christian joy, justly regarded by Baur as the key-note and fundamental idea of the epistle, would be quite too simple for a pseudonymous composition; and the device of a money-remittance as its motive, in discussing which the pseudonymous writer is moreover represented as putting himself in contradiction with manifest facts of the genuine Pauline Epistles, would be too clumsy.

5. Nevertheless, after the question had been newly raised by Hitzig (*Zur Kritik d. paul. Briefe*, Leipz., 1870) and Hinsch (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, 1), Holsten again attacked the epistle with new methods and entirely new results (*Jahrb. für protest. Theol.*, 1875, 3; 76, 1, 2). The theory of a Gnostic interpretation is here abandoned, as also its classification with the union-efforts of the second century. According to Holsten, a Pauline unionist of the first century, nearer to 70 than 90, carried out the conciliation-

policy already begun by Paul in the Roman Epistle a step farther, in order to restore the internal unity of the mixed Church at Philippi by the combining power of love and identity of religious consciousness touching true righteousness, to inspire the fainting mind of the Church with new and joyful energy, and to attach it to the Apostle with renewed love.¹ By the acutest analysis of the doctrine, mainly in the direction of the criticism of Plank and Köstlin, and by the most minute examination of the language and style, Holsten has endeavoured to prove that they are un- and even anti-Pauline. The fact that the author disclaims the name of an apostle on behalf of Paul, and contents himself with the title of a *λειτουργός*, that the Pauline *διάκονοι* are connected in the address with the Jewish-Christian *ἐπίσκοποι*, that in the thanksgiving for the gift no real thanks are expressed but the character of Paul is defended, while the relation of the Philippians to him is no longer apprehended in a correct historical manner; all this is in his view decisive for a post-apostolic authorship. P. Schmidt (*NTliche Hyperkritik*, Berlin, 1880) has again defended the genuineness of the epistle in a very blunt way, strikingly refuting Holsten's arguments in detail, but not on the whole going beyond his conception of the historical premisses of the epistle. It must in fact be conceded to Holsten, in a more comprehensive measure than Schmidt is

¹ All that Paul tells of his state and frame of mind in captivity, of his wishes and hopes, as well as what he says of Timothy and Epaphroditus and of the present he had received, rests according to Holsten on trustworthy tradition; while the violent polemic against Judaism to which iii. 2 is justly referred, has its origin in the impression made by the catastrophe of the year 62, in which James the Just met his death. Holsten has indeed succeeded in setting aside, though not in solving, the question raised by himself, as to how an epistle coming to Philippi in the name of the Apostle at a time when there were still in that place many members of the Church (among them probably Epaphroditus himself) who had lived through the Pauline time and knew that the great apostle was dead, could be received by them as genuine.

willing to allow, that our epistle presents a certain variation from the Paulinism of the older epistles, particularly when they are made so pointedly logical, and are so doctrinally interpreted as is often the case.² The same thing applies to the language of the epistle. It is incontestable that this epistle also has many peculiarities of expression; and unless we refuse to make the doctrinal vocabulary of the four great epistles a measure of the Pauline, it is inconsistent to pass a milder judgment on the Philippian Epistle alone in this respect, since it is natural that such difference should be more apparent in the letters that are richer in doctrine. Even objections, such as those drawn from the absence of the title Apostle and the occurrence of the *ἐπίσκοποι*, remain insuperable from the standpoint of Hilgenfeld's criticism. Later investigations have certainly confirmed the genuineness of the Philippian Epistle anew; but this view must lead further, if it is not to be always fluctuating.

6. When the Acts say that Paul remained two full years in Rome (xxviii. 30), and yet it is acknowledged that they cannot have been written at the close of these two years or else the account would have been quite differently expressed, it follows incontestably that a decided turn in the Apostle's fortunes took place at the end of these two years; but we have no hint as to whether this was his death or his deliver-

² The Christology of the Philippian Epistle goes beyond that of the older epistles, though perhaps not to the point to which Holsten pushes it; the more rigid doctrinal form, in which an expression like iii. 6 would certainly be impossible, is less apparent in it; while the endeavour to bring the doctrine of salvation into closer connection with practical life, has even in some cases a direct ethical tendency. Notwithstanding the scanty doctrinal material of the epistle, there is no lack of emphasis attached to knowledge (i. 9; iii. 8, 10), although a practical turn is mostly given to it; and in passages such as ii. 10; iii. 20 f. the cosmic significance of Christ and of the work of salvation are plainly enough intimated. Even the exhortation to unity so strongly emphasized, and the reference to Judaism and Heathenism in chap. iii. remind us of the Ephesian Epistle. In all these respects we are unable to separate the Philippian Epistle from the others written in captivity.

ance; at all events it was necessary to explain the breaking off of the author from the object of his work. He certainly seems in *xx.* 25 to betray complete ignorance of the Apostle's return to his former mission-field; and therefore knew nothing of his deliverance from the Roman captivity, since even if the farewell discourse in Miletus be referred to ear-witnesses, it must at all events have been freely enough reported to allow modification of expression, in case the author knew that the expectation of Paul was not fulfilled. Yet it cannot be mistaken that the description of the departure-scene (*xx.* 37 f.) presupposes this definite conception of Paul's presentiment; as also that it was not fulfilled in the consciousness of the author of the Acts, since according to *xx.* 22 ff. and the entire representation of the Jerusalem-journey (comp. *xxi.* 13) it is obviously the martyrdom threatening him in Jerusalem which he supposes to be the ground of this foresight of the Apostle and of his tearful departure.¹ Thus much is historically certain, that even if the arrival of the Apostle in Rome be put as late as possible, viz. in the spring of 62 (§ 25, 7, note 2), the two years had still elapsed before the outbreak of persecution after the burning of Rome in the summer of 64; and Paul is as likely to have escaped this catastrophe by his release as to have met his death in it. The passage in Dionysius of Corinth (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 2, 25) does not imply that Paul came to Rome along with Peter and that both suffered martyrdom together, which would certainly put this to a later date; but even if such were the meaning, so much allowance

¹ Whoever sees in this a prophecy that naturally fulfils itself, must admit that *Phil.* i. 25 stands in irreconcilable opposition to it; and those who regard the Philippian Epistle as spurious must either assume with Hinsch that the idea of deliverance from the Roman captivity is distinctly expressed in it; or with Holsten, that such traditional though unfulfilled forebodings could be attributed to the Apostle even after his death, viz. that Acts *xx.* 25 proves nothing against deliverance from Roman captivity.

has to be made for the rhetorical pathos of this passage, that it cannot be regarded as historical evidence. The *κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν* undoubtedly refers only to the time of Nero, in which Tertullian also puts the death of the two apostles (*Scarp.*, 15).² But if there is any truth in the tradition that Peter was crucified and Paul beheaded (*de Præscr. Hær.*, 36), it certainly does not point to the horrors of the year 64, in which Paul's Roman citizenship would not have saved him from the death of a slave; moreover Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, III. 1, 1) already regards the work and death of the two apostles at Rome as essentially contemporaneous, which can hardly have happened during the captivity with which we are acquainted.³

If indeed it could be proved that Paul had actually made the journey into Spain that he had formerly projected, it would of course be necessary to assume that he was released from the first Roman captivity. But the strongly coloured rhetorical passage in Clement of Rome, according to which Paul went up and down like a herald, teaching the whole world righteousness (ad Cor. 5, *καὶ ἐπὶ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἑλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου*), is utterly inadequate to prove that such was the case.⁴ The idea that the Muratorian Canon seems to

² From the way in which Clement (ad Cor. 6, 1) passes from the martyrdom of Peter and Paul to the martyrs of Nero's persecution (*τούτοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν—συνηθροίσθη πολλὸ πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν*) it by no means follows, as Hilgenfeld, Seyerlen and Harnack (on this passage) maintain, that he supposes them also to have been slain during this persecution. That both apostles died a martyr's death in Rome, we know from Caius of Rome (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 2, 25), who believes he can still show their monuments or the places of their martyrdom.

³ The *Prædicatio Petri* also assumes a meeting of the two apostles in Rome. But when the *Acta Petri et Pauli* in their representation of the martyrdom of Paul, make no mention of a second Roman captivity, and the *Histor. Apostol.* of the Pseudo-Abdias excludes it, they have no authentic historical foundation.

⁴ Without venturing upon artificial explanations of the *τέρμα τ. δύσ.*, it must be conceded that a reference to the extreme western limits of the *orbis terrarum*, viz. to Spain is possible from a Roman standpoint, although it is just as likely to refer to a limit assigned to the Apostle in the West (comp. Schenkel, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1841, 1). But the peculiar

presuppose a journey to Spain on the part of the Apostle, rests, like the similar view current with the Church Fathers since the fourth century, solely on Rom. xv. 24, 28; while the statement of Origen (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*; 3, 1), which seems to preclude the idea of such a journey, undoubtedly from its wording goes back simply to Rom. xv. 19. It is a fact that we have no historical trace of Pauline Church-foundations in Spain, which makes this Spanish journey highly improbable; but since Paul during his captivity at Rome thinks only of returning to his old missionary field of labour (Phil. i. 25 f., ii. 24) and therefore seems to have given up this journey (at least for a time), the probability that it was never accomplished is by no means prejudicial to the view of his martyrdom during the captivity with which we are acquainted.

7. Eusebius professes to have heard (λόγος ἔχει) that Paul was released from his first imprisonment, continued his preaching, and suffered martyrdom during a second imprisonment under Nero (*H. E.*, 3, 22). In this captivity he puts the second Epistle to Timothy where Paul speaks of his former defence and of his deliverance from the mouth of the lion (2 Tim. iv. 16 f.), *i.e.*, according to his (undoubtedly false) interpretation, of the release from the first captivity. Luke who alone was with him at that time (iv. 11), was not present at his first answer (iv. 16) and therefore was not able to record the favourable termination of his first captivity. It was the more probable, however, because Nero was more gently disposed during the first period of his reign, and it was only later that he became more cruel. From these exegetical and historical considerations it is clear that the release from the first captivity was not even in the opinion of Eusebius a simple historical tradition but an assumption handed down, which he felt bound to support by all means in his power. Later writers have simply repeated the same thing, from Jerome down (*de Vir. Ill.*, 5), who added the year of Paul's death, making him die on the

way in which the arrival at this goal is connected with his *μαρτυρία* before the rulers of the world, both being made descriptive of his departure from the world (comp. the *ὄψις*), is decidedly in favour of Rome being meant by this *τέρμα*.

same day with Peter. The Roman Church puts Paul's death in the year 67; but Gelasius declared it heresy not to hold that both apostles died on the same day. We must therefore abide by the view that Paul's deliverance from his Roman captivity can neither be proved nor denied on secure historical grounds.¹ But Eusebius is quite right in thinking, however faulty his exegetical proof, that if the Pastoral Epistles are genuine, which he never doubted and which he by no means attempted to establish by the assumption of a second Roman captivity as has often been represented, they afford a proof that Paul was released from the Roman captivity with which we are acquainted, and only suffered martyrdom during a second captivity.

Paul's release from the captivity at Rome has again been maintained and defended by Church-historians like Flacius, Clericus, Tillemont, Fabricius, Mosheim, Neander and Gieseler; among Introduction-writers by Michaelis, Hänlein, Bertholdt, Hug, Schott, Guericke, Credner, Neudecker, Ewald, Bleek, L. Schulze, and especially by expositors of the Pastoral Epistles down to Hofmann. On the other hand it has been disputed by Hammond, Lightfoot, Cave, Petavius and Lardner, and again recently by Hensen, Schrader, Niedner, as also in the Introductions of Schmidt, Eichhorn and de Wette, and in the interest of disputing the Pastoral Epistles, by the whole Tübingen as well as the later critical school. Even among defenders of the Pastoral Epistles, it has been abandoned by Wieseler, Thiersch, Ebrard, Schaff, Reuss, Otto, and others. Köhler on the contrary endeavoured to prove a third and even fourth Roman captivity.

¹ All objections that have been raised against his release on *à priori* grounds are of a trifling character, since it is by no means clear that his condition in the second captivity, as described in the Epistle to Timothy, was absolutely the same as in the first, as described in the Philippian Epistle; but even if this were the case, we know nothing whatever of the relations under which he again became a captive, and cannot therefore perceive to what extent he was favoured or what privileges he enjoyed. Nor does the second Epistle to Timothy show more than that he was visited by friends (i. 16 f., v. 9, 11 f.) and was permitted to correspond with them.

§ 27. THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

1. *The first Epistle to Timothy* implies that Paul had shortly before been in Ephesus, which Hofmann manifestly disputes only on account of the expectation to which the Apostle gives expression in Acts xx. 25. During his short stay in that place he had observed much that urgently called for reform. In particular a new mode of teaching had been adopted that seemed to the Apostle to be altogether unsound and suspicious. His attempt to put this down in his usual energetic and peremptory fashion (comp. § 18, 1), had only called forth violent opposition; contention respecting words had given rise to anger; and those who were attacked, in defending themselves had become more and more foolish in their assertions and more and more reckless in resisting the Apostle's authority; so that Paul had been obliged to pass the severest judgment on two of them (i. 19 f.).¹ Urgent matters then called him to Macedonia; and he commissioned Timothy who was with him at this time, to remain at Ephesus for the purpose of counteracting the false teaching (i. 3). He hoped soon to return himself and to restore things to perfect order. But his return was unexpectedly delayed; and though he was in constant hope of being able to hasten it, yet it was just as likely to be still longer delayed (iii. 14 f.). Hence he deemed it necessary to

¹ This was deliverance unto Satan, such as he had formerly intended against the fornicator at Corinth (1 Cor. v. 5), and which he had now actually inflicted on Hymenæus and Alexander, because they slandered his person and therefore the authority given him by the Lord. The former, according to 2 Tim. ii. 16 ff., belonged, with a certain Philetus, to those whose profane babbling increased to more ungodly assertions by their attempted opposition; whether the second was Alexander the smith, who afterwards did him much evil during his trial at Rome (2 Tim. iv. 14 f.), or whether he had anything to do with the Alexander mentioned in Acts xix. 33 (§ 20, 7), is quite uncertain. In any case the way in which both are spoken of in the second epistle does not imply that this one must have been written earlier than our first.

write to Timothy to give him more definite instructions regarding the charge entrusted to him; and in case Timothy should have to take his place at Ephesus for a still longer time, to furnish him with directions as to his teaching and official work there (iv. 13). After the introductory greeting (i. 1 f.) he naturally enters first on the charge he had already entrusted to his assistant, referring him, in opposition to the erroneous teaching of the day (i. 3-10), to the essence of Christian saving truth as revealed to him in his own experience (i. 11-17); and pointing to the sad end of Hymenæus and Alexander earnestly enjoins him to war against such errors (i. 18 ff.). He then proceeds to discuss certain points of order regarding divine service that seemed to him to require regulating, in particular the matter of Church-prayers (ii. 1-7), as well as the respective behaviour of men and women at such time (ii. 8 ff.); and as at Corinth, he distinctly forbids women to come forward publicly at divine service (ii. 11-15). Moreover in appointing officers of the Church Timothy is to see that regard be had to entire blamelessness in moral and probation in domestic life (iii. 1-16). The second leading division of the epistle enters upon the ministry of Timothy, in which he is to take the place of the Apostle in the event of his return being still longer delayed. The fact that Paul here sets out with the danger of ascetic errors threatening the future (iv. 1-5) is due to his desire to check certain ascetic tendencies of his pupil in the beginning (comp. v. 23; iv. 6-11); on the other hand, owing to his natural timidity, he requires to be admonished to take up his position as the Apostle's representative with joy and zeal, trusting in the gift he had received (iv. 12-16).² When Paul, in the act of giving him direc-

² We do not indeed know how old Timothy was when Paul took him to be his assistant; but we see from 1 Cor. xvi. 10 f. that he was still young enough to feel a certain timidity in coming forward and fear lest he should be despised on account of his youth. Ever five to six

tions concerning his conduct towards persons of different ages in the Church (v. 1 f.) dwells at length upon a special point that seemed to him to need regulating in Ephesus, viz. the support of widows (v. 3-8) and in particular their position in the service of the Church (v. 9-16); when he passes on to the claim of elders distinguished for activity in teaching to be supported by the Church (v. 17 f.), and again to the exercise of discipline with respect to such elders as incur blame in their official capacity, as well as to the means of preventing such aberration (v. 19-25); and when he returns to the way in which Timothy is to regulate the behaviour of slaves (vi. 1 f.); all this is in keeping with the freedom of a letter. The epistle ends as it began with directions as to Timothy's conduct with respect to prevailing errors of doctrine. In delineating these (vi. 3 ff.) he is led to speak of the dangers of covetousness (vi. 6-10) not because Timothy had had anything to do with the unfruitful theology of the time, of which Hofmann accuses him without cause, but because a perverted zeal concerning doctrine in Ephesus arose in many cases from interested motives. After having admonished him, on the contrary, to the zealous practice of the true ministry (vi. 11-16), the Apostle is led by what he has just said of covetousness to address a charge to the rich (vi. 17 ff.) by way of supplement, and only then concludes with a few powerful words enforcing the main business on account of which Timothy had been left behind at Ephesus, and with the benediction (vi. 20 f.).

2. The position implied in the first Epistle to Timothy cannot be shown from the life of Paul so far as we are acquainted with it. We only know of one journey made by the

years later, his age still bore a certain disproportion to the leading position he had to take in relation to the Church with its rulers and mature men owing to the charge with which he was entrusted by the Apostle. That the exhortations and instructions on the part of the Apostle who was perhaps twice as old, are unsuited to his age, is an assumption that cannot however be maintained.

Apostle from Ephesus to Macedonia (Acts xx. 1). He did not however then leave Timothy behind, but had already sent him forward (to Corinth) through Macedonia (xix. 22, comp. 1 Cor. iv. 17); and even if Timothy had returned before his departure for Ephesus (§ 20, 7) Paul could not have left him behind in Ephesus, for he was with the Apostle in Macedonia (2 Cor. i. 1). If, however, we assume that Timothy did remain at Ephesus for a time, he certainly did not there await the return of the Apostle, which the latter cannot have arranged as in our epistle, since it was his intention to go to Corinth there to winter, and thence to travel to Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 3 ff.), a journey in the course of which he eventually passed by Ephesus without stopping (Acts xx. 16).¹ In order therefore to find a time more in keeping with the situation implied in i. 3, the Ephesian visit has been connected with the Apostle's second visit to Corinth mentioned in the second Epistle to the Corinthians (§ 19, 1), to which place the Apostle is said to have travelled through Macedonia during his three years' sojourn at Ephesus. This course has been adopted by Schrader, Wieseler and Reuss following the precedent of Mosheim, as also by Eylau (*Zur Chronologie der Pastoralbriefe*, Landsberg a. d. W., 1873 and 1884) who put this journey between the first and second Corinthian Epistles. But this visit to Corinth can only have been of short duration; and an absence of uncertain length from Ephesus, such as our epistle presupposes, is absolutely precluded by Acts

¹ This point of time, although formerly accepted without hesitation after the example of Theodoret (comp. Michaelis, Schmidt, Hänlein, Hug, Hensen, Anger, and even Aberle, *Tübinger Quartalschrift*, 1873, 1), is quite impossible. Only by the most arbitrary perversion of the sense of i. 3, has Otto (*die geschichtlichen Verhältnisse der Pastoralbriefe*, Leipzig, 1860), recently followed by Kölling (*der erste Brief Pauli an Tim.*, Berlin, 1882), been able to make out that Paul on the contrary remained at Ephesus, and gave Timothy the instructions contained in this epistle to take with him for the journey of visitation to Macedonia (and Hellas) mentioned in Acts xix. 22.

xx. 31; nor does xx. 29 f. show any trace of doctrinal errors having previously made their appearance in Ephesus. But it is impossible for Paul, during a temporary absence, to have set his disciple the task of reforming abuses that had developed under his own eyes or of adjusting relations in which he had himself worked for years. In addition to this, our epistle implies a longer existence of the Church and more fully developed forms of Church-life; whereas the Church there had only been founded during the second and third years' sojourn of the Apostle in that place. All other combinations that have been attempted in the interest of the situation here implied, require still more arbitrary hypotheses or perversions of the sense of words (1 Tim. i. 3).²

3. In the *second Epistle to Timothy* we find the person addressed still at Ephesus. Paul had not therefore returned thither as he had arranged, but had on the contrary again become a prisoner and been carried to Rome, where he lay in chains (i. 16 f., comp. i. 8, ii. 9)¹ This alone can be the

² If with Flacius we assume a reference to the Apostle's departure from Ephesus narrated in Acts xviii. 21, we must make up our minds to strike out the *εἰς Μακεδονίαν* with Märcker (*die Stellung des drei Pastoralbr. im Leben d. P.*, Meiningen, 1861, and Progr. of 1871), who also adopts the view of a residence at Ephesus on the part of the Apostle before his first missionary journey. If following the example of Grotius, we adopt with Bertholdt the time of Acts xx. 3 ff. we must, contrary to the wording of the Acts, separate Timothy from companionship on the journey, or with Matthies and Beck (*Komm.*, v. 1840, 1879) make the *προεβύμενος* refer to Timothy, by which however we gain nothing; for at that time Paul had no intention of returning to Ephesus (comp. Acts xx. 16). The same thing applies to Schneckenburger and Böttger, who tried to change the *προσμεῖναι* into *προσμελναι*, and to put the epistle at one of the stations on the journey to Jerusalem. According to Paulus, for whom Otto led the way by his perversion of i. 3, the epistle is even said to have been written during Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea.

¹ Hence there can be no question of transferring the epistle to Cæsarea, as Thiersch and Böttger attempted to do. The Roman names moreover, in iv. 21, are in favour of Rome. It cannot indeed be directly proved that the person addressed was in Ephesus; which has been

cause of the deep despondency of Timothy implied in i. 8. The captivity of the Apostle cannot have been of very short duration, for the reason that intelligence of it had already penetrated to Ephesus. Paul had already called on several who were in Asia Minor, as for example Phygellus and Hermogenes, to come to Rome and appear for him; but they had refused, probably from fear of being implicated in his suit. On the other hand the Ephesian Onesiphorus had of his own accord sought him out and refreshed him exceedingly in his bonds (i. 15 ff.). Paul had already made his first defence, during which no man stood by him; and Alexander the Ephesian, against whom he finds it necessary to warn Timothy, had by his evidence that gave the lie to the Apostle's words, done him much evil (iv. 14 ff.). This time the Lord had wonderfully helped him (iv. 17), but he looked forward to certain martyrdom (iv. 6-8). The accounts received of Timothy (probably through Onesiphorus) are very sad; he seems to have lost all spirit and pleasure in working for the cause of the gospel (i. 6 f.). Hence Paul resolves to send him another letter. He begins, after the introductory greeting (i. 1 f.), by thanking God for all he had hitherto heard of Timothy's unfeigned faith inherited from his mother and grandmother, and longs to hear more that he may be filled with joy (i. 2-6); making this the basis of an exhortation to Timothy in the power of the Spirit of God to allow his gift no longer to lie idle but, trusting in Him who has done everything for our salvation and will therefore also give us the necessary strength, not to be ashamed of him and of his bonds, but to suffer with him for the gospel (i. 7-11).

doubted by Spitta (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1878, 4), who puts him in Derbe. But since the services of Onesiphorus, well known to Timothy, were rendered at Ephesus, and Timothy is directed to salute his household (i. 18, comp. iv. 19); since Hymenæus of 1 Tim. i. 20 is mentioned (ii. 17), while greetings are sent (iv. 19) to Aquila and Priscilla, who to our knowledge dwelt at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 19), this is the only probable conclusion; and iv. 12 is by no means at variance with it.

He points out how he himself was not ashamed of the gospel (i. 12-14), and how Onesiphorus, as contrasted with so many others, was not ashamed of his chains (i. 15-18). Timothy is not indeed to stand alone in this warfare, but is to place faithful teachers at his side, of whom as of himself the axiom holds good, that the service of the Lord is not free from suffering (ii. 1-7); moreover he is to remember that the gospel for which Paul suffers proclaims the Risen One who will raise up His true followers to live with Him, as an encouragement to the elect to the same perseverance (ii. 8-13). He is to put all those who desire to help him in teaching also in remembrance of these things, and earnestly to warn them against useless and pernicious strife about words, setting them an example of true teaching, since contention with those who have fallen into the doctrinal errors of the time only leads them to greater perversity of assertion and to the subverting of the faith (ii. 14-18); while true union with the unchanging genuine Foundation of the Church can only be shown by zeal in self-purification and preparation to be a vessel meet for the Master's use (ii. 19-21). Hence he is to flee the youthful lusts of emulation and strife, and as becomes the servant of God, to endeavour with gentleness to lead those who are carried away by the errors of the time, to repent and to abandon their evil ways (ii. 22-26). Where, however, this was visibly a sign of immorality and false piety such as should prevail more and more in the future, and there was therefore no prospect of breaking their conscientious resistance to the truth; in such cases he was to turn entirely away from them (iii. 1-9) and only hold fast for his own part to the course he had taken at his conversion in imitation of the Apostle, a course also involving the same suffering (iii. 10-13); which the teaching he had received and the Holy Scripture he had known from childhood could and would enable him to do (iii. 14-17). Then follows the solemn exhortation Paul had in view from the beginning

(i. 6 ff.), admonishing him faithfully to fulfil his calling as a preacher of the gospel even amid growing opposition; and concluding by a reference to his own joy in face of the martyrdom before him (iv. 1-8). This exhortation manifestly forms the testament of the Apostle to his Timothy in case the latter should never meet him again in this life; but it is his earnest wish to see him once again. Hence the charge to Timothy to come to him speedily, arising out of communications as to his position in Rome (iv. 9-18), is again urgently repeated, after some messages of greeting (iv. 19 ff.). Salutations from the Christians at Rome and the usual benediction form the conclusion (iv. 21 f.).

We see from the personal matter at the close (iv. 10-13), that only Luke was with Paul when he wrote the epistle; but he can only have arrived a short time before, for he was not present at Paul's first hearing (iv. 16). Of Demas, whom he found with him in Cæsarea (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24), he complains that he had forsaken him for love of the world, and had gone to Thessalonica. Titus, who had formerly been his companion at Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 1, 3) and had rendered him such important services in his dealings with Corinth (2 Cor. vii.-ix.), had gone to Dalmatia; Crescens, of whom we have no knowledge, to Galatia. Manifestly therefore Paul feels isolated and longs for his favourite pupil. Timothy can set out at once, because Paul has sent Tychicus to Ephesus to relieve him. Moreover, he is to bring Mark with him, for whom Paul has urgent commissions, and to whom therefore he seems to be fully reconciled (comp. Col. iv. 10). Timothy is also to bring with him a cloak and books left by Paul with Carpus at Troas. The way in which Erastus and Trophimus, persons from whom he is separated, are casually mentioned when sending greetings to Ephesus, is peculiar (iv. 20). Since the latter was an Ephesian (Acts xx. 4, xxi. 29), and the former, whether identical with the Chamberlain of the city of Corinth or not (Rom. xvi. 23), was sent out from Ephesus (Acts xix. 22), and therefore had close relations with that place, both seem to have accompanied the Apostle from Ephesus (comp. 1 Tim. i. 3); the notice here appearing to be intended simply as an explanation why Paul sends them no greeting. He does not know if they are there, for Erastus remained behind at Corinth and he himself had left Trophimus who wished to accompany him still further, sick at Miletus.

4. This epistle also cannot be assigned to the Roman captivity with which we are acquainted, simply because it is inconceivable that Timothy, who had been with the fettered Apostle in Cæsarea and Rome (Col. i. 1; Phil. i. 1), should now all at once be ashamed of his chains, as if they were an indication that he had been forsaken by God (2 Tim. i. 8). Yet all who put the death of the Apostle in the first Roman captivity (§ 26, 7), must adopt this time. Because Timothy, who had been ordered to Rome according to our epistle, was with the Apostle (Phil. i. 1), it seemed most natural to put the epistle in the beginning of the captivity, at all events before that to the Philippians; and this is what Schmidt, Matthies, Otto, Reuss, and Beck, following Baronius, Lardner, and others, have actually done. But this is quite inconsistent with the presentiment of death expressed here so clearly, which Otto alone has succeeded in explaining away; nor does the Philippian Epistle, in which the Apostle speaks so differently, contain any trace of the experiences mentioned in our epistle (i. 15-18, iv. 14-18), notwithstanding its abundant information respecting Roman relations. If for this reason we put it with most of the older expositors (comp. also Hensen, Wieseler) at the end of the captivity and after the Epistle to the Philippians, we are still at a loss to understand how Timothy, who was to have gone to Philippi only when the Apostle's case was decided, in order to bring him news from that city (Phil. ii. 19-23), can now be in Ephesus, while the trial is still pending. But whatever explanation may be given to these relations by combinations more and more artificial in character, it is plain from iv. 13, 20, that Paul had recently been at Troas and Miletus probably also in Corinth, although he had touched at none of these places on his transport-journey (Acts xxvii.). If we assume a reference to the journey to Jerusalem, that certainly led from Corinth by Troas and Miletus, we cannot understand why the Apostle four or five years

later should tell Timothy who was his companion on that journey, that Trophimus, who moreover was with the Apostle in Jerusalem, was at that time left behind sick at Miletus; nor why he only now sends for the things he had then left at Troas. All the combining ingenuity of apologists has so far failed to do anything whatever towards the actual removal of these impossibilities.¹

5. *The Epistle to Titus* implies that Paul had shortly before been in Crete; but not that he had worked there as a missionary. Christian Churches must already have been in existence there for a considerable time, since i. 6 requires probation in Christian family life; and since Paul left his Gentile-Christian assistant there in order to regulate the affairs of the Church as he desired (i. 5), thus including it in his missionary sphere, the Churches there must have been essentially Gentile-Christian, drawn from the native population (comp. i. 12 f.). This naturally does not imply that there were no converted Jews there even among the teachers of the Church (i. 10).¹ On visiting the island, Paul had

¹ Criticism on the other hand maintains that the pseudonymous writer might certainly have had the journey to Jerusalem in his mind (Acts xx.), but was unconscious of the difficulties raised by transferring the epistle to the captivity mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30 f. But if he drew his knowledge of the relations into which he transfers himself, solely from the Acts and the Pauline Epistles, it must have been an easy matter for him to have found more abundant and convenient points of attachment, and to have avoided such transparent contradictions, for which no motive can be shown.

¹ We must not, however, infer that there were many such in Crete, for the passage only states that there were (in Crete) many *ἀντιλέγοντες* (ver. 9), characterising them as unruly talkers and deceivers, and adding that the Jewish-Christian *ἀντιλέγοντες* were especially unruly (comp. Rom. x. 21), which is easy to understand, because according to i. 14, the doctrinal errors rested on Jewish myths with which they naturally believed they were best acquainted. On the other hand i. 11 of course refers to the Cretan *ἀντιλέγοντες*, as *αὐτῶν* and *αὐτοῦς* in ver. 12 show, since only in that case could the Apostle appeal to their national character for their deceptive and avaricious conduct, and specify the myths in which they dealt as Jewish, in opposition to those of Crete. If this simple explana-

found suspicious aberrations of doctrine; and seems in attempting to put them down by his authority, only to have called forth violent opposition especially from the Jewish-Christian teachers (i. 10). He therefore deemed it advisable, since he himself was obliged to depart, to leave Titus behind, and thought he could best overcome these errors by the presbyterian organization which the Churches still lacked, especially if in appointing bishops regard were had not only to blamelessness and proved morality (i. 6 ff.), but also to capacity for teaching (i. 9). We do not know how long it was after leaving the island that he wrote to Titus; for it is certainly an error to suppose that he would have sent him written instructions as soon as possible, since he had already given him verbal directions (i. 5). On the contrary the occasion of his writing was altogether external. Zenas, the former teacher of Jewish law, and Apollos, his old Corinthian fellow-worker, were travelling by Crete; and Paul took advantage of the need for commending them to the assistance of the Churches (iii. 13 f.), to give them a letter to Titus, in which he enforced the charge he had given him at his departure by new reasons; also furnishing his pupil with additional directions of various kinds for his work there. It certainly was his intention to relieve him by sending Artemas or Tychicus; and he directed him in this case to go to Nicopolis, where he proposed to pass the winter (iii. 12); but apart from the fact that Paul best knew with how little certainty he could calculate on carrying out such far-reaching plans, Titus had hitherto had sufficient time for following the instructions of the Apostle. Still more fully than in the Epistles to Timothy does Paul in the inscription put forward the service of his apostleship as his reason for turning to his spiritual child with an official writing (i. 1-4), going on to

tion of the matter be darkened by obscure exegesis, it should at least not be made a mark of spuriousness; since we fail to see why a pseudonymous writer should move entirely in doubtful contradictions,

speak of the charge he had given for the organization of the Churches (i. 5-9) and assigning the doctrinal errors that prevailed in Crete as its reason (i. 10-16). He directs him as to the way in which he is to exhort those of different ages and especially slaves (ii. 1-10) on the basis of sound doctrine whose morally fruitful character he expressly develops in detail (ii. 11-15). He then tells him to put the Churches in mind of their true relation to the ruling powers and the non-Christian world in general, for which their own experience must be their guide (iii. 1-8); and finally once more impresses on Timothy the true course to take with respect to errors of doctrine (iii. 9 ff.). Personal matter and salutations form the conclusion (iii. 12-15).

6. The situation which this epistle presupposes does not at all fit in with what we know of the Apostle's life. So far as we know, Paul touched only once at Crete, on his transport-journey to Rome (Acts xxvii. 8-13). But Titus i. 5 cannot refer to this time, as Grotius supposed; for the Acts know nothing of a greeting of the Churches in that place, and in no case could Paul as a prisoner have become so accurately acquainted with their condition as our epistle implies. Nor was Titus at that time in his company; and so far as our knowledge of his subsequent life reaches, Paul was never again in a position to arrange his place of abode so freely as he does in iii. 12, but was in bonds, of which our epistle contains no hint. It was necessary therefore to try, as Schmidt, Schrader and Anger did, to combine the journey to Crete, not mentioned in the Acts, with the second visit to Corinth, regarding which they are also silent; and to which recourse had already been had to explain the situation implied in the first Epistle to Timothy (No. 2).¹ How this was made to agree in detail with the combination made for the first

¹ Capellus has transferred the Cretan journey to the second missionary one, and has made it start from Syria and Cilicia (Acts xv. 41), Michaelis from Corinth (xviii. 1-8), while others make the Apostle visit Crete on

Epistle to Timothy, whether the Apostle was supposed to have gone by Corinth to Crete, as Wieseler and Otto maintained; or the reverse, as held by Reuss and Eylau, who had no hesitation in making the journey mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 3 lead through Crete to Macedonia, is naturally a matter of indifference. It is certain that by connecting another visit to Crete with that journey from Ephesus, and a mission to Illyria with the plan of wintering in Nicopolis, a combination made almost unavoidable by Titus iii. 12, we become more and more perplexed as to the statement of the Apostle that he had worked in Ephesus uninterruptedly for the space of three years (Acts xx. 31). It is equally certain that Titus, who is said to have remained behind in Crete, was with the Apostle towards the end of his stay at Ephesus, therefore about Pentecost (§ 20, 7), although he was not to be relieved until the autumn; while Paul intended to pass the winter of that year not in Nicopolis but at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 5).²

7. It may nevertheless be conceded that owing to the in-

the journey from Corinth to Ephesus (xviii. 18 f.), as do Hug, Hensen, Schott, or on the so-called third missionary journey from Galatia (xviii. 23), as do Credner and Neudecker. But so far as we know, Paul first came in contact with Apollos (Tit. iii. 13) during his abode of several years at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 12), with Tychicus first in Acts xx. 4, while we have no knowledge of Titus having been with the Apostle at any of these times; and the plan of wintering at Nicopolis (iii. 12) cannot be put into any of the journeys of that time with which we are acquainted, even if we suppose the Cilician Nicopolis to be meant, which is highly improbable.

² An appeal to the alteration of his plans of travel is of no avail, since such had already taken place when he gave this promise to the Corinthians (§ 20, 1). Hence Blau (*de genuina eorum verb. indole, quibus P. ep. ad Tit. scr. præf.*, 1846), following Petavius and Hammond, brought the Cretan journey down to the Apostle's stay in Macedonia (Acts xx. 1), where Titus came to him from Corinth, only to be immediately sent back again (2 Cor. vii. 8), so that he cannot then have been left in Crete, irrespective of the fact that Paul would not have taken Crete twice on his journey, at a time when everything drove him to Corinth. Matthies, following Baronius and Lightfoot, comes down even to the winter abode in Hellas

completeness and inaccuracy of the Acts, it is not in itself impossible that the difficulties of all former combinations may be overcome by new and ingenious hypotheses; however strange it may appear that the Acts which afford the necessary points of attachment for all other Pauline Epistles, should in this case throw us back on mere hypothesis. Even that possibility however is definitely excluded by the striking affinity which these epistles bear to one another, and which is only consistent with their genuineness in case of their having been composed much about the same time; but the second Epistle to Timothy, even if it be placed at the very beginning of the Roman captivity, is separated by more than three years from the time in which at the earliest a place can be sought for the other epistles. Moreover, in proportion to the affinity of doctrinal peculiarity and mode of expression by which the older epistles are characterized, does second Timothy differ from them; yet all the former combinations put this epistle so close to the other captivity-epistles, both of which are even put with the Roman and Corinthian Epistles, that the difference is as inexplicable as the resemblance. But in the doctrinal errors, as well as in the needs of Church-life which they presuppose, the same phenomenon occurs. These have no analogy in the older epistles, and are moreover so closely allied to one another that they point of necessity beyond that time of the Apostle's life with which we are acquainted. It is therefore firmly established that if our epistles are to be pronounced genuine, they can only belong to a period of the Apostle's life lying beyond that with which we are acquainted. And since we have seen, that although Paul's release from his Roman captivity cannot be historically proved, it cannot on the

(Acts xx. 2), where Paul could not have undertaken a sea-journey, nor planned a residence at Nicopolis for the following winter, since he intended to set out at once on his Roman journey after visiting Jerusalem.

other hand be contested (§ 26, 7), the possibility remains that our epistles are the sole monuments and evidences of a life-period subsequent to this captivity that have come down to us. There would be no object in attempting from these memorials to construct a connected life of the Apostle during this time; since we are absolutely without knowledge as to how far sufficient material for such an attempt is supplied by the events accidentally touched upon. We only know from his transport-journey (Acts xxvii.) how easily Crete might be taken in travelling from the West to the East; so that the visit to Crete implied in Tit. i. 5 may have been made on the journey immediately following Paul's release. We know that during his four years' imprisonment he had the intention of seeking out once more the Churches of anterior Asia and Macedonia (Philem. 22; Phil. ii. 24). The fact that according to 1 Tim. i. 3 he had been in Ephesus and had set out for Macedonia is quite consistent with this; for there is no reason why he should not have visited the Phrygian Churches before that of Ephesus. It is certainly not improbable that he also paid another visit to Corinth from Macedonia; and the circumstance of his having touched at Troas and Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 13, 20) implies the same coast-journey that we have already seen him make in these waters. From what station on this journey he announced the postponement of his return to Ephesus (1 Tim. iii. 14 f.) and made arrangements for spending the next winter at Crete (Tit. iii. 12),¹ we know as little, as the time, place, and circumstances of the new arrest and transportation to Rome that frustrated all his plans. It is only certain that

¹ When old manuscripts and versions and the Fathers date the first Epistle to Timothy from Laodicea, they were probably thought to refer to the epistle mentioned in Col. iv. 16, as Theophylact shows. Others, as the Synopsis and Euthalius, assume that it was written in Macedonia. The subscription of the Epistle to Titus which dates from Nicopolis rests on an evident misunderstanding of iii. 12.

when the latter part of the summer had arrived, he was again a prisoner in Rome, and earnestly entreated Timothy to come to him before the *mare clausum* (2 Tim. iv. 21).

The very diverse and therefore mutually destructive hypotheses by means of which it has been sought to combine the data of the Pastoral Epistles into a finished picture of the Apostle's life, are utterly valueless. If we assume with Huther (*Komm.*, 4 Aufl., 1876) that Paul was set free in the spring of 63 and perished in the persecution under Nero in July, 64, only five quarter-years, it is true, remain to be disposed of; but even these fully suffice to cover the data actually supplied by the Pastoral Epistles, unless with him we vainly strive to find a place within this period of time for the wintering in Nicopolis, which however was only a plan most probably frustrated by his arrest, or even for the journey into Spain that Paul had evidently already abandoned (§ 26, 6).² But if we suppose that the Apostle was released in the spring of 64 and did not perish in that year's persecution under Nero, there is room enough in the four years of Nero's reign still remaining not only for the journey into Spain; but even, with Hofmann, for one into Syria (on account of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he ascribes to Paul and dates from Antioch). Even in this case, however, it is very improbable, according to Phil. ii. 24, that he went first to Spain, as Guericke and Bleek hold; but whether he went first to Crete as Laurent maintains, or only went there afterwards from Ephesus (Macedonia), is altogether uncertain. If he were allowed a still longer interval, as is by no means impossible, it must have been *before* the composition of our epistles that are undoubtedly near together in point of time. But whether first Timothy was written before or after Titus—a matter of complete indifference in case of their genuineness—the plan of wintering at Nicopolis by no means precludes the possibility of an antecedent return to Ephesus, of which Paul held out a prospect to Timothy.³

² As a matter of fact, it is scarcely probable that Paul, who according to 2 Tim. iv. 6 looked forward so definitely in the autumn to martyrdom, should have remained alive until the summer of the following year, without any memorial of this time having come down to us; or even, as Huther maintains, that he should in the spring of the following year have invited Timothy to come to Rome speedily, before the winter set in (iv. 9, 21).

³ Nothing leads us to suppose that the winter for which he summons Timothy to Rome is any other than that which he originally intended to spend at Nicopolis. On the contrary, the journey of Titus to Dalmatia (iv. 10) might easily consist with the fact that he had sought the Apostle in vain in the Illyrian Nicopolis to which he had summoned him (Tit. iii. 12).

§ 28. THE PECULIARITIES OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

1. It is characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles, in the first place, that they combat certain doctrinal errors of which we find no trace elsewhere in the Pauline Epistles, but which were at that time in the air as it were; since we meet with them in Crete as well as in Ephesus.¹ It was not a question of actual error that denied or combated the truth of salvation, a fact that has constantly been ignored or directly contradicted; but of teaching strange things that had nothing to do with saving truth (1 Tim. i. 3, vi. 3), of foolish and presumptuous inquiry (2 Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 9; comp. i. 4) respecting things of which nothing is or can actually be known (1 Tim. i. 7, vi. 4), which moreover are altogether unprofitable and empty of truth (Tit. iii. 9), so that they lead only to vain talk (*ματαιλογία*, 1 Tim. i. 6, comp. *ματαιολόγοι*, Tit. i. 10), to profane babbling, destitute of all true religious value (*βέβηλαι κενοφωνίαι*, 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 16). Those who occupy themselves with such things think by this means to attain to and participate in knowledge of an exceptionally high character (1 Tim. vi. 20, *ψευδώνομος γνῶσις*); but it is only pride that intoxicates (vi. 4), and the idea of a higher knowledge that carries them away

¹ That the errorists of the Epistle to Titus stand quite outside the Church, as Credner and Mangold assume; or even that all the errorists of our epistles were pure Jews who mixed their theology with Hellenic wisdom as Otto supposed, can by no means be proved. It is just as impossible to follow Thiersch and Hilgenfeld in distinguishing heterogeneous categories in the phenomena attacked in the Pastoral Epistles, such as Pharisaic Judaists and spiritualizing Gnostics; or unevangelical narrow-mindedness and unchristian latitudinarianism (comp. Stirn, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1872, 1). Wiesinger (*Komm.*, 1850) and Hofmann have done most towards a correct apprehension of the doctrinal errors, although even the latter, misled by a distorted view of them, thought it necessary to make a distinction between the phenomena mentioned in 2 Tim. ii. 17, iii. 6, 7, and the errorists elsewhere attacked.

(2 Tim. ii. 26).² Profane and foolish Jewish myths seem always to be the proper subject of these speculations (1 Tim. iv. 7; comp. i. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 4; Tit. i. 14), and endless genealogies (1 Tim. i. 4; Tit. iii. 9) such as are presented in the Old Testament; an attempt being made to gain all kinds of mysterious wisdom by allegorizing them; even the Thora with its legal definitions must have been turned to account in the same way, since legal doctrine and strivings about the law which are incidentally referred to (1 Tim. i. 7; Tit. iii. 9), cannot, according to the context, have gone beyond a purely theoretical treatment of the law.³ But no characteristic error of doctrine is mentioned, since the assertion (2 Tim. ii. 18) that the resurrection had already passed is only adduced as an example of those ungodly statements to which individuals expressly mentioned by name had been driven when

² It is of course only possible to fall into these things if unaffected love of truth and simple faith be lost (1 Tim. vi. 5; comp. i. 6, 19; 2 Tim. iii. 8), since they always lead farther and farther from faith and truth (1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. ii. 18). The question turns on a false striving after knowledge, arising from an unhealthy state of the religious life. Hence it finds satisfaction in unfruitful speculations that have nothing whatever to do with what is necessary to man's salvation.

³ A practical tendency appears only in Tit. i. 14, where reference is certainly made to the institutions of men, which according to i. 15 must have been mainly attached to the Old Testament distinctions of clean and unclean, since those who originated them are undoubtedly characterized as unbelieving Jews (i. 16); a fact which indeed is generally misapprehended. But it does not appear that the so-called errorists generally followed ascetic tendencies; for 1 Tim. iv. 1-3 refers to an error respecting the future, resting on fundamentally destructive, dualistic views, which however is placed in no sort of connection with present doctrinal errors. Nor has the terrible corruption of morals foretold in 2 Tim. iii. 1-5 any direct connection with them, although it would naturally increase the disposition for such doctrines as had no moral value (iv. 3 f.). But the fact that it will conceal itself under the cloak of piety brings the Apostle to the nominal piety of those teachers who only satisfy religious curiosity, without leading to moral improvement (iii. 6 f.). Nor does it appear that they practised magic arts; for the term seducers (iii. 13) as applied to them is only called forth by a comparison with the Egyptian sorcerers, which is expressly limited to their conscious resistance to the truth, and the manifestation of their folly (iii. 8 f.).

engaged in disputations. Hence there is no admonition to dispute with them or to defend the truth against them, Timothy being even warned against the unripe lusts of youth (2 Tim. ii. 22). All that is required is to avoid these speculations (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 16; Tit. iii. 9), and to refuse to enter upon them (1 Tim. iv. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 23).⁴ The question turns only on the conduct of the erring as such, never on their doctrines; for suspicion does not attach to these in themselves but to the injurious effects of personal conduct, which leads necessarily to strife and vain contentions about words (Tit. iii. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 4 f.; 2 Tim. ii. 23); since each empty assertion can with equal right be met by counter-assertion (1 Tim. vi. 20: *κενοφωνίαί καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδοδόμου γνώσεως*), and finally to divisions (Tit. iii. 10: *αἰρετικὸς ἄνθρ.*). It injures Christian life by turning aside from the one thing needful to matters religiously as well as morally unfruitful (2 Tim. ii. 14; iii. 6 f.), and may even lead to assertions that directly tend to the subverting of the faith (ii. 18), a singular remark when the subject under discussion is *à priori* an erroneous doctrine hostile to faith. It embroils family life (Tit. i. 11), finding easiest access to women owing to their religious excitability (2 Tim. iii. 6), and finally is only calculated to profit the adepts of the new wisdom (1 Tim. vi. 5).

2. Even Irenæus and Tertullian, who make no claim whatever to an historical interpretation of our epistles, found the Valentinian series of æons in the *fabulæ* et *genealogiæ*; and

⁴ He is simply to forbid the teaching of these things (1 Tim. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 14), to stop the mouths of the talkers, to censure them sharply (Tit. i. 11, iii. 10), and after repeated admonition to break off all intercourse with them (iii. 10), but is exhorted where there is any prospect of success to instruct them with gentleness (2 Tim. ii. 24 ff.). Hence their *ἀντιλέγειν* (Tit. i. 9), their *ἀντιδιατίθεσθαι* (2 Tim. ii. 25), their *ἀντιστάσαι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ* (iii. 8) do not denote their opposition to certain doctrines, but their resistance to interference with their conduct, which might lead them to blaspheme those who denounced it (1 Tim. i. 20).

in 1 Tim. i. 4 in particular a condemnation beforehand of Marcion's indeterminables quæstiones (Tert., *adv. Val.* 3, *de Præscr. Hær.* 33, *adv. Marc.* i. 9, comp. Iren., *adv. Hær.*, I., præf.). When Hammond and Mosheim and even de Wette discover in them an attack on the Gnostics, they have in mind the beginnings of Gnosticism in the first century; it was Baur who first made their polemic refer to the Gnosis of the second century, which according to his view of the statement of Hegesippus (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 22) did not make its appearance until Trajan's time; especially to the Marcionites. For example, he made the ἀντιθέσεις of 1 Tim. vi. 20 refer to Marcion's well-known work, in complete opposition to the context and wording; the νομοδιδασκαλοι and the μάχαι νομικαί (i. 7; Tit. iii. 9) to his fundamental attack on the law, which he found combated in 1 Tim. i. 8. But although he was followed by Volkmar and Scholten, Schwegler found himself compelled to combine an allusion to the Valentinians with that to Marcion, on account of the Patristic reference of the γενεαλογία to Gnostic series of æons, which was also accepted by Baur; while Hilgenfeld added Saturninus and the Marcosians; and Lipsius (in his *Gnosticismus*, Leipzig, 1860), Pfeiderer and Schenkel went back to the pre-Valentinian Ophitism. Holtzmann however has shown (*die Pastoralbriefe*, Leipzig, 1880) that no allusions to a concrete formulated sect are anywhere to be found; he therefore adopts the view of a general attack on incipient Gnosticism, the Judaistic features interwoven in the picture (Tit. i. 10, 14, iii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 7) being attributed to the part previously played by the pseudonymous writer; since a natural colouring could not be given to letters of the Apostle, whose life-work consisted in the struggle against Judaism, without polemic against this system. Criticism itself has thus plainly conceded that the delineation of doctrinal errors contained in our epistles does not harmonize with what we know of Gnosticism from history.

Appeal being continually made to the *ψευδώνυμος γνώσις* of 1 Tim. vi. 20, Holtzmann himself has at last been obliged to concede that it is not an antignostic shibboleth adopted by the author of our epistles from Hegesippus whose words are more probably to be found in Euseb., *H.E.*, 4, 22, but that it is on the contrary Eusebius himself (*H.E.*, 3, 32) who refers to our epistles. The only passage in which an attack on dualistic Gnosis is still found (1 Tim. iv. 1-3), foretells a phenomenon of the future that is visibly expected to force its way in from heathen soil (No. 1, note 2); 2 Tim. ii. 18 treats not of an axiom of the errorists, but of an exceptional statement to which some have been driven in opposing them (No. 1, comp. § 27, 1, note 1); while Tit. i. 16 refers not to the pretence of a special knowledge of God but to unbelieving Judaism (No. 1, note 2). Mangold has convincingly shown that the *γενεαλογία* neither is, nor from the context can be, a designation of the Gnostic series of æons; and neither the self-seeking conduct of the so-called errorists (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 20), nor the fact that they turn with their propaganda to the more active religious need of the less critical female sex (2 Tim. iii. 6), is exclusively a sign of Gnosticism. Thus the whole weight of proof for the reference of the epistles to Gnosis finally rests on the fact that expressions in them, which according to the context have an entirely different meaning, are made to refer polemically to the distinction of classes of men metaphysically different (1 Tim. ii. 4; Tit. ii. 11), to the distinction between the supreme God and the Demiurge and to the Gnostic double personality of Christ (1 Tim. ii. 5), to the partial rejection of the Old Testament (2 Tim. iii. 16) and such-like; while echoes of Gnosticism are again found in such passages as 1 Tim. iii. 6, in the great doxologies of 1 Tim., and in expressions like *αἰῶνες, ἐπιφάνεια*, etc.

Starting on the other hand from the undoubted Judaistic features, it was natural to refer the polemic of the epistles to the old Pharisaic opponents of the Apostle, who proved their title to the kingdom of God by means of genealogical tables. And though Patristic expositors, like Chrysostom and Jerome, or dogmatic ones, like Calovius, might incline to this view, yet it is too obviously contradicted by the fact that their well-known pretensions are nowhere attacked in our epistles.¹ Hence Augustine thought of the theosophy

¹ The notion of a Jewish learning that ascribed a special significance for religious life to its researches respecting the historical and legal contents of the Torah, developed by Hofmann; or Kölling's hypothesis of Judaists who dissipate the facts of salvation into ideas, retaining only

traditionally transplanted into Judaism; while Herder, Schneckenburger, Olshausen and others, especially M. Baumgarten) *die Echtheit der Pastoralbriefe*, Berlin, 1837), following Grotius, directly characterized the errorists as cabbalists. But since the roots of the Cabbala cannot be proved to have reached back into the apostolic age, Hug and others with greater caution adhered to a Judaism influenced by Oriental philosophy, which gave rise to the view most widely adopted by the defenders of the epistles, that we have to do with the beginnings of Judaizing Gnosis or Gnostic Judaism reaching back into apostolic times.² Mayerhoff assumed a special reference to the Cerinthian Gnosis, while Mangold (*die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*, Marburg, 1856), after the example of Michaelis, Wegscheider and others, found Essenism even here, and met with assent from Grau, Immer and later commentators. But here too the differences far outweigh the casual resemblances.

While no trace either of Judaism or of the Docetism of Cerinthus is to be found in our epistles, Mangold has very ingeniously developed Philo's view of the allegorical application of the Old Testament genealogies to the *τρόποι τῆς ψυχῆς* (comp. Dähne, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1833, 4), though without being able to give conclusive evidence of this having been shared by the Essenes or combated in our epistles. Everything else that he adduces is either not exclusively applicable to them, or can only be traced back to them by means of rash hypotheses. It was indeed very natural to regard the ascetics of the Roman Epistle, as well as the ascetic theosophists of the Colossian Epistle, whom we have also traced back to Essene influences, as the precursors of the tendency combated in our epistles. But this tendency shows no ascetic feature (comp. No. 1, note 2); nor can it with certainty be alleged that the speculations in which it indulged were of a

dry genealogies of the Old Testament history of salvation, is quite unintelligible and without historical foundation.

² This view, represented by Guericke, Reuss, Böttger and Neander; among commentators by Mack, Matthies, Huther, has often made entirely groundless concessions to the opinion which adopts the Gnosis of the second century, and is exposed to the just reproach of carrying into the apostolic period phenomena that can only be proved to belong to the second century.

theosophic nature, especially since all reference to the doctrine of angels or angel-worship is wanting; for it is certainly an error to interpret the genealogies as ranks of angels.

We have therefore no certain historical link with which to connect this phenomenon; but there is the less ground for asserting that these aberrations of a newly-awakened striving after knowledge, that are at least parallel with those of the Phrygian Churches and do not in any case exhibit traits of later Gnostic phenomena, cannot belong to the apostolic age in the strict sense of the word.

3. It is only natural for those who adopt the view of a living development of Pauline teaching, such as is actually presented in the successive epistles and may be accounted for by the historical relations that called them forth, to assume that the new spiritual movements in the Christian Church on which the Apostle's eye is fixed in our epistles, must have had some influence on his mode of writing. It is of course self-evident that they could have no power to change the essence of his doctrine of salvation. Wherever this finds deliberate expression (1 Tim. i. 12 ff.; 2 Tim. i. 9 ff., ii. 10 ff.; Tit. ii. 11 ff., iii. 3 ff.), it is specifically Pauline. There certainly is no detailed proof of the fact that the doctrine of salvation rests on the death and resurrection of Christ; although where touched upon the thought is genuinely Pauline; nor is it shown that the need of salvation has its root in the fleshly condition of man, although the conceptions of *νοῦς* and *πνεῦμα* are employed in the true Pauline sense; but in letters to his trusted disciples who share his faith, and where doctrinal errors not at variance with it are concerned, there is no need of such proof.¹

¹ It was therefore quite a mistake to regret the absence of the antitheses of the older epistles in various passages, although a more careful consideration of the context might have shown that it absolutely excluded them. It is only the reference to what is Gnostic (No. 2) brought into isolated expressions, that gives them a strange appearance or leads to

It is only in the doctrine of election, the fundamental conceptions of which are reproduced in a truly Pauline form, that a certain change appears, not indeed consisting, as has been supposed, in an emphasizing of the universality of the Divine purpose of salvation (1 Tim. ii. 4, iv. 10), but in the fact that Paul no longer holds all members of the Church to be elected (2 Tim. ii. 19 f.) owing to the experiences he had made, particularly in the latest disturbances; while he all the more emphatically declares the Church in its unchanging foundation to be the ground and pillar of Truth (1 Tim. iii. 15). The conception of the completed kingdom of God as the heavenly kingdom of Christ (2 Tim. iv. 18) coincides with the development of the Christology in the Captivity Epistles; while the fact that the persons addressed were to live to see the return of Christ (1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1), can only be got rid of by transforming them into representatives of future office-bearers. And if the Apostle's interest in celibacy has visibly diminished (1 Tim. v. 14, ii. 15; but compare iii. 2, 12, v. 9; Tit. i. 6), this too must be accounted for by experience of a hazardous nature (comp. 1 Tim. v. 15).

The peculiarity that nevertheless characterizes the Pastoral Epistles consists not merely in a withdrawal of the strict dogmatic teaching already met with in the Captivity Epistles, but in the prominence of a universal religious element as opposed to the specific Christian element, that seems to be reduced to certain leading points perhaps already firmly formulated, and an absence of the concrete world of ideas to which we are accustomed in Paul's writing as compared with a more abstract phraseology. But even in the case of Paul, his doctrine of salvation, which was arrived at through severe conflict, shared by his disciples and no longer assailed even amid the errors of the present, was gradually compelled to assume the form of a completed possession, whose mediating gradations receded more and more into the background.

their being restamped in the interest of a preconceived view of the epistles, just as *πίστις* was taken in the sense of justification, or remote tendencies of ecclesiastical polity were put into utterances respecting the Church. In the same way it is only by artificial interpretation that anything un-Pauline has been put into utterances respecting the position of the Christian to the law (1 Tim. i. 8 ff.) and the Scripture of the Old Testament (2 Tim. iii. 16), respecting Judaism (2 Tim. i. 3 ff.) and heathenism (Tit. iii. 3 ff.).

Hence the emphasizing of "sound doctrine," whose contents form absolute truth, and on whose appropriation in faith and truth everything depends. On the other hand present disturbances must have revealed to him with increasing clearness how little the Church was in a position to follow him into the whole depth of his knowledge of salvation or in the apprehension of his form of doctrine with its individual stamp; and how easily it might be led aside into the more convenient ways of unfruitful speculation. Hence the return to the great leading points that had already passed over into the common faith; and the intentional adherence to the expression already given to these in it. But in proportion as the doctrinal errors of the present were due to a morbid state of religious life (1 Tim. vi. 4; comp. Tit. i. 13, ii. 2), was Paul obliged to go back to the deepest foundation of such life, emphasizing pure piety and a good conscience, as well as its close connection with sound doctrine or truth (1 Tim. iii. 16, vi. 3; Tit. i. 1). In opposition to a striving after knowledge which was entirely unfruitful and even destructive of religious life, he had to bring into prominence the educating character of the revelation of Divine grace (Tit. ii. 11 ff.), to emphasize the ἀγαθὰ and καλὰ ἔργα, and to require exemplification in the closest and simplest relations of life of the piety developed by Christian truth.³ Moreover the greater prominence given to the doctrine of reward,

³ A specifically Pauline representation of the Christian life as resting on community of life with Christ and on the Spirit is by no means wanting (2 Tim. iii. 12; Tit. iii. 5 f.); but it recedes into the background because the question turns less on its central foundation than on its external development. Concepts which express the individual and social value of Christian morality (σωφροσύνη σεμνότης) rather than its religious character, are prominent; and the fundamental conceptions of εὐσέβεια, πίστις, δικαιοσύνη, appear in the frequent enumeration of the indications of true Christian life in a line with special Christian virtues, without the necessity of marking their close relation, although this very thing has much that is analogous in similar enumerations of the older epistles.

though by no means at variance with the older Paulinism (1 Tim. iii. 13, vi. 18; 2 Tim. i. 16, 18), is in keeping with the fact that greater stress is laid in our epistles on motives of a general religious character, pointing to contact with simpler New Testament forms of doctrine. The nearer the Apostle saw his end approach the more desirous he must have been to give universally intelligible expression to his teaching, and to support it by reasons most likely to meet with general acceptance.

4. If we would rightly estimate the peculiarity of expression in the Pastoral Epistles, we must not forget that we have here to do with simple precepts and directions to trusted disciples; in 2 Tim. likewise with a word of touching admonition. The polemic against the doctrinal errors of the time, is not designed to refute them, but to assign reasons for the directions given respecting them; reference to the great fundamental truths of the gospel is not made for the purpose of defending or even developing them, but in order to establish proper points of view and aims for the ministry of the disciples. We have no right to expect logical development, complicated periods, a richer use of particles, or the *anacolutha* (anomalies) of the doctrinal and polemic epistles, or even the long-drawn sentences of the epistles of the captivity, with their overflowing abundance of accumulated participles and prepositions, although traces of such are not wanting.¹ It must further be taken into consideration that our epistles are on the whole somewhat monotonous in expression, the very same words and turns, with slight variation, recurring again and again; a circumstance which, from the nearness of time when they

¹ Compare the long periods 2 Tim. i. 3-5; Tit. iii. 4-7, the change and abundance of the prepositions (Tit. i. 1-3, iii. 5 f.), the *anacolutha* (anomalies) 1 Tim. i. 3 ff.; Tit. i. 1 ff. How unequally the conjunctions and prepositions missed by Holtzmann are distributed in the other Paulines, has been convincingly shown by Kölling.

were composed and the complete similarity of subjects of which they treat, is at least as easily explained as the parallels of the Roman and Galatian Epistles, of the two Thessalonian Epistles, and of the Ephesian and Colossian Epistles.² The language of our epistles has nevertheless a peculiar colouring, confined almost exclusively to words and phrases; for even Holtzmann has scarcely discovered any real grammatical peculiarities. Undue value has indeed been attached to the Hapaxlegomena of our epistles, as the statistics of this phenomenon, so zealously prosecuted of late, have shown, since they are very unequally distributed among the other epistles; only a small number, by their frequent recurrence, appearing as actual peculiarities of our epistles. We cannot dispute the fact that our epistles contain a great number of favourite expressions not found elsewhere in Paul, or only in isolated cases, particularly if we also take into consideration groups of words from the same stem or compounded in the same way, as well as combinations of words and turns of expression. Much of this has to do with the doctrinal errors combated in them, which are naturally characterized in the same way; as also with the new mode of teaching adopted by Paul in opposing them.³ Finally the similar

² Though criticism declares the far-reaching agreement that is nevertheless shown with the older epistles in store of words and turns of expression, to be an indication of literary dependence, yet it is only tendency-exegesis that has been able to furnish a semblance of proof in favour of this assumption. There is nothing at all strange in the fact that this extends also to the writings of Luke, since they likewise proceed from a disciple of Paul. But it is quite in harmony with the vital wealth of the Pauline diction that the same ideas and thoughts are in some cases differently expressed, or analogous expressions employed with new modifications, and is sufficiently explained by a more careful and unprejudiced exegesis.

³ Hence the recurrence of *μῦθοι* and *γενεαλογίαι*, of *ζητήσεις* and *λογομαχίαι*, of *βέβηλοι κενοφρονίαι* and of *ματαιολογία*, of *ἀστοχεῖν*, *περίστασθαι* and *παρατρέσθαι* in combating them. So too *θεοὶ σωτήρ* may be used by preference with distinct allusion to their empty speculations respecting God, as also *ἐπιφάνεια* and similar expressions. But we must not as-

treatment of the qualifications for office in the Church, as also the frequent repetition of the same or similar thoughts, lead of themselves to the recurrence of the same words and phrases. The peculiarity of expression certainly exceeds what can be explained in either of these ways; and in many of its aspects defies all attempt at explanation.⁴ But in the Latinisms of the epistles (*δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, χάριν ἔχειν, ἀδηλότης, πρόκριμα*) that are simply due to the many years' captivity at Rome, and the fact that there is much to remind us of the Philippian Epistle which is nearest to them in time (*προκοπή, ἀνάλυσις, κέρδος, σεμνός, ἐν πᾶσιν, ἐπέχειν, σπένδεσθαι*, etc.), we have at least a hint how easily influences that elude all proof, may in gradual development combined with an

sume with Otto that the Apostle had in any sense adopted the shibboleth of the errorists, since Paul declares the substance of their doctrine to be utterly devoid of all religious character. Hence on the other hand the many derivatives of *διδάσκειν*, the similar expressions by which sound (or beautiful) doctrine or speech is always characterized, the constant recurrence of *εὐσέβεια* and kindred expressions, of *ἀγαθὴ (καθαρά) συνελθῆσις*, of *ἀγαθὰ (καλὰ) ἔργα*, of words that are grouped about *σωφροσύνη* or *σεμνότης*, and much of the same kind.

⁴ To such peculiarity belong words like *ἀρνεῖσθαι* and *ὠφέλιμος*, numerous compounds with *φίλος* and word-forms from *μάρτυς* and *οἶκος*, not all of which are in keeping with reference to family life; as well as phrases like *διαβεβαιοῦσθαι περὶ τίνος, ἀνθρώπος θεοῦ, παγὶς τοῦ διαβόλου* that appear twice, and *διαμαρτύρεσθαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (κυρίου), ὧν ἐστίν*, that appear three times, besides *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* that occurs five times, and *ἐν πᾶσιν* that occurs six times. To this may be added the want of so many expressions elsewhere characteristic of the Apostle. Though much must be subtracted from what Holtzmann has collected, yet the absence of the groups of words that revolve round *φρονεῖν, ἐνεργεῖν, περισσεύειν, πλεονάζειν, ὑπακούειν, ἀποκαλύπτειν, καυχᾶσθαι* has something striking. The attempt to explain the peculiarity of expression in the epistles from the age of the Apostle, after the manner of Guericke, is forbidden by the fact that they are separated from the Philippian Epistle only by a few years at most; and that it is customary for language in old age to become impoverished and stereotyped rather than enriched or modified. Kölling's crotchet that the cultured Paul speaks in scientific terminology with his disciples of like erudition, can hardly be taken seriously.

individuality so unique, have called forth a process of transformation even here.

5. Again, the Apostle's care for Church organization is peculiar to our epistles.¹ In Crete it is to be brought about by the nomination of elders (Tit. i. 5); in Ephesus where a twofold Church-office had long existed, mistakes of appointment are to be guarded against by careful observance of the necessary qualifications (1 Tim. iii. 1-13, v. 22).

From this it already appears that we have not to do here with a definite model according to which Church-organization was to be universally carried out; for since the *νεώτεροι* (Tit. ii. 6) as opposed to the *πρεσβύται* and *πρεσβυρίδες* (ii. 2 f.) can only be a designation of age (comp. 1 Tim. v. 1 f.), there is no allusion yet to a second office in the Church such as existed at Ephesus; and the assumption that there were deaconesses as well as deacons at Ephesus (1 Tim. iii. 8 ff., 12 f.), rests on an impossible interpretation of iii. 11, where from the context there can only be an allusion to the wives of the deacons, or of 1 Tim. v. 2. In like manner we see that Paul, who regarded it as hazardous for his comparatively youthful helpers to occupy themselves with the spiritual guidance of young persons of the female sex, and counselled great prudence where this might incidentally happen (1 Tim. v. 2, *ἐν πάσῃ ἀγγελίᾳ*), left it to the matrons at Crete to do this in their stead (Tit. ii. 4 f.). On the other hand, in the more matured relations of the Ephesian Church there were already widows who, having a specially conferred ecclesiastical post of honour, practised this duty as their active calling; and for the judicious appointment to this honorary post the Apostle also gives minute directions (v. 9-14).²

¹ Apart from the first journey, that Paul made with Barnabas to carry out the commission of the Church at Antioch, and on which he is said to have everywhere made provision for the appointment of presbyters (Acts xiv. 24), we have nowhere in the earlier epistles found him troubling himself about this matter. Of an organization of the Galatian Churches we have no knowledge. Of the Corinthian we know definitely that an office for Church-government and discipline did not exist. Whether Paul took any part in the appointment of rulers of the Church at Thessalonica (1 Thess. v. 12), of bishops and deacons at Philippi (Phil. i. 1), of the Ephesian presbyters (Acts xx. 17), or of the deaconess at Cenchrea (Rom. xvi. 1) we are absolutely without knowledge. Comp. § 19, 3.

² Baur's former view, that only virgins bearing the honorary title of

Nevertheless, all that has so often been said respecting the hierarchical tendencies of our epistles is entirely without foundation. We find as yet no trace of the parallelism of the New Testament Church office with the Old Testament hierarchy, that made its appearance so early. Nowhere is mention made of the rights of officers of the Church; or even of any special dignity belonging to them.³ With strange inconsistency offence has been taken at one time with the greatly reduced claims said to be made by our epistles in the qualification of Church-officers; while at another time the requirement that they should be monogamists, is regarded as laying the foundation of a peculiar sanctity of office and of a sacramental character attaching. But it is overlooked that the giftedness and inclination to it that are obvious qualifications for the bearing of office are nowhere mentioned, only the fact being enforced that these are insufficient for a salutary administration, without blamelessness in civil relations and probation in Christian life. But if abstinence from second marriage (comp. 1 Cor. vii.) is in true Pauline fashion reckoned among those things that protect the office-bearer from all reproach and ensure for him necessary respect in the judgment of the Church, it is nevertheless clear from the very circumstances of its being put on a par with other postulates, as also from 1 Tim.

widows are here meant, has long since been refuted; but the existence of this arrangement is another sign that our epistles belong to the later apostolic period; and the care which the Apostle devotes to it is certainly in keeping with the fact that the relations of the time made him look upon a firmer regulation of Church-life as necessary.

³ Neither can the putting of the rulers of the Church together into a collegiate board (1 Tim. iv. 14), which only expresses their complete equality, raise them to a higher rank, nor can a contrast between the state of clergy and laity be implied in 1 Tim. v. 20, since *οἱ λοιποὶ* must according to the context be referred to the other presbyters. 1 Tim. iii. 10 has as little reference to a special time of probation that had to be gone through by the deacons, as has iii. 13 to a distinction of rank in Church offices, or iii. 1 to an ambitious strife for the episcopate.

v. 9, that there is no thought of any specific sanctity of character.⁴ Above all, it is significant that no trace is yet to be found of the exaltation of the monarchical episcopate above the presbyterian Church-administration, which is so definite a characteristic of the post-apostolic time. Even Baur has virtually abandoned the attempt to prove that the epistles contain something of this kind; an attempt that was natural for him to make in the first place, owing to his conception of them; and it is now held to be beyond dispute that the bishops of 1 Tim. iii. 2 ff., next to whom deacons are named as a second office (iii. 8 ff.), can only be identical with the presbyters spoken of in v. 17 ff.; as follows directly from Tit. i. 5, 7. The reason that ἐπίσκοπος is by chance employed only in the singular in 1 Tim. iii. 2 and Tit. i. 7, is obviously that in both cases it is immediately preceded by τις, and is by no means at variance with the fact that the two expressions are merely designations distinctive of the dignity and office of the persons who administered the affairs of the Church on a perfect equality.

6. Since the interest taken by our epistles in a firmer Church organization is essentially conditioned by the dangers which threatened the life of the Church, and these had their foundation mainly in the doctrinal errors of that time, it is easy to understand the importance attached

⁴ Although Beyschlag (*die Christl. Gemeindeverfassung*, Harlem, 1874) finds a mark of the post-apostolic time in the fact that the appointment to office in the Church takes place without participation on the part of the Church, it neither appears from the χειροτονήσαντες (Acts xiv. 23; comp. x. 41), nor from 2 Cor. viii. 19, where the question turns on the choice of trustworthy men for the conveyance of the collections, that an actual choice of the Church took place in the apostolic time. Even Titus i. 5 gives no particulars regarding the *modus* of the appointment of presbyters; on the contrary the qualifications to be settled by the judgment of the Church, and the proof required in 1 Tim. iii. 10 certainly presuppose the Church's participation: and in v. 9 where reference is made to enrolment of ecclesiastical widows, the Church is certainly the acting body.

to the establishment of sound doctrine. The fact that teaching was permitted to all, and was not bound up with a particular office, is shown by the very existence of such doctrinal errors, as well as by the command forbidding women to teach (1 Tim. ii. 12). But the more favourable this state of things was for the spread of unsound doctrine, the more urgently does Paul impress on Timothy to find trustworthy men for the work of teaching, and to commit it to their charge (2 Tim. ii. 2). This could be done most easily and safely by connecting such teaching with the official administration of the Church. Hence the Apostle reckons ability to teach among those qualities in which a bishop must not be lacking, whatever may be his capacity for his special calling (1 Tim. iii. 2); explaining the reason of his injunction in Tit. i. 9 by a reference to prevailing errors of doctrine. He expressly commends to special honour those presbyters who engage in teaching; and gives exactly the same reasons as in 1 Cor. ix., for the claim they thus obtain to be supported by the Church (1 Tim. v. 17 f.); while the widows, like all others, are only to be maintained by the Church in the case of their being left completely desolate (v. 16; comp. v. 3-8). The need of sound doctrine was indeed sufficiently provided for by the apostolic disciples who represented the Apostle in the Churches.¹ The *χάρισμα* given to Timothy (i. 6; comp. 1 Tim. iv. 14) is not an official grace that had been transmitted to him; but according to the context is undoubtedly a capacity for

¹ Preaching is the main work enjoined on Titus (ii. 1, 15, iii. 8) as also on Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 6, 11, vi. 2, 12) even in the matter of representing the Apostle, with which he is expressly charged (iv. 3, 16). The whole of the second epistle leads up, after much preparation, to the solemn concluding exhortation (iv. 1 f.). The *ἔργον εὐαγγελιστοῦ* is the special *διακονία* that he has to perform (iv. 5); just as the vocation specifically committed to the Apostle, that he himself in face of his near approaching end could not fulfil (iv. 6 ff.), was the *εὐαγγελιζέσθαι* (1 Cor. i. 17).

preaching the gospel wrought in him by the Spirit. In the bestowment of it the question is not one of the transference of an office with an especial position of dignity and exclusive privileges; it is the exercise of teaching in which none should despise the disciples of the Apostle on account of their youth (1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 15). Their only other duty consists in transmitting the Apostle's directions to the Church or in carrying out his instructions in it: their fixed independent activity consisted in teaching. It was only in the more matured relations of the Ephesian Church that the need arose to charge Timothy on his own responsibility with the solemn induction of elders into their office, and with their discipline (1 Tim. v. 19 ff., 22);² and this seems to be the point at which, when apostles or apostles' disciples could no longer conduct the supreme administration of the Church, monarchical episcopacy was of necessity developed from internal needs.

While it was formerly made a common ground of objection that the alleged Paul treated his disciples in our epistles quite too like schoolboys, the very position of these apostolic disciples has been recently regarded as the ideal held up by the writer of the epistle to his time, of a head thus appointed by apostolic arrangement (comp. Weizsäcker, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1873, 4), and hence the model of episcopacy, as Pfeiderer, Hausrath and others put it, or even of the archbishop or metropolitan, as Holtzmann holds. But these disciples of the Apostle, whom he recalled and sent back at his convenience (2 Tim. iv. 9, 12; Tit. iii. 12), and who

² 1 Tim. v. 17 has as little to do with stewardship on the part of the apostolic disciples, as 1 Tim. v. 22 with the restoration of the fallen. The assertion that we here find Church-discipline already at an advanced stage of development, is entirely without foundation. Belonging to *στερεὸς θεμέλιος* is made to depend not on Church-discipline but on self-discipline (2 Tim. ii. 21). Titus iii. 10 f. treats neither of heretics nor of heretical processes in the later sense (Titus iii. 10 f.), but of the conviction that the man who causes divisions will not accept correction, for which reason nothing remains but to treat him as commanded (i. 11, 13). The only real measure of discipline that is mentioned (1 Tim. i. 20), is that intended in 1 Cor. v. 5, and is carried out by the Apostle himself.

only represent the Apostle in caring for that which he had left unfinished until his return (Tit. i. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 13), are in fact very little fitted for a type of the bearers of continual and independent power in a single or provincial Church. The only respect in which they were really to take the Apostle's place after his death, was not in the assumption of specific powers, but in preaching the gospel (2 Tim. iv. 5 f.); and that was by no means the real aim of the monarchical or hierarchical development of Church government. Not they as the bearers of a definite office but the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15), which neither implies correct doctrine as such, nor its protection against errorists. Hence our epistles contain nothing in support of this alleged episcopal position of the apostolic disciples but the so-called ordination of Timothy; although, if this is to be taken as the model of later episcopal ordination, it is very striking that nothing similar is recorded of Titus who yet occupied the same position. The *χάρισμα*, which was given in the solemn act mentioned in 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6, is, as shown above, not official authority and dignity, but a capacity for preaching the gospel; and this is not conferred by the conveyance of office as Beyschlag still holds, but on the ground of prophecy, which promises this Divine gift to him who is ordained (1 Tim. iv. 14; comp. i. 18). Hence the laying on of hands that essentially constituted this act of consecration can only, in conformity with the symbolism of the act established in the Old and New Testament, represent and guarantee the transmission of this promised gift to the recipient. Moreover the co-operation of the *προφήτεια* in this act makes it impossible that the author should have cited it as an ecclesiastical act that was always to be performed at the regular conveyance of a definite office.³ Finally, since according to 1 Tim. v. 22, the presbyters were also inducted into their office by the laying on of hands, it is clear that we have not to do here with the conferring of a specific (episcopal) official character. Compare Kühl, *die Gemeindeordnung in den Pastoralbriefen*, Berlin, 1885, and J. Müller, *die Verf. d. christl. Kirche u. d. Beziehungen ders. zu d. Krit. d. Pastoralbriefe*, Leipzig, 1885.

³ It is hardly necessary to mention that this so-called ordination of Timothy did not take place in Ephesus where Paul left him as his representative, as Otto, Huther and others maintain, but in the Church of his home when Paul took him as his assistant. Moreover neither 1 Tim. vi. 12, where Timothy is only reminded of his baptism, nor 2 Tim. ii. 2, where the apostolic teaching is in question, treats of this ordination. That the rite of the laying on of hands was a mark of post-apostolic time, can only be asserted by denying all credibility to the Acts (vi. 6, xiii. 3) and overlooking the fact that in its completely analogous use in baptism (Heb. vi. 2) and in imparting the Spirit (Acts viii. 17, ix. 17, xix. 6) it was an early Christian custom.

7. As regards worship also, our epistles already show greater development of form; but it is very significant that traces of this are only to be found in the epistles to Timothy, where we have to do with a Church that had already been in existence for a long time. The very care for the constant exercise of the work of teaching points to a time when the rich stream of Christian inspiration that sprang out of the gifts of grace peculiar to the early time, began to ebb; much more the fact that Paul deemed it necessary to make express regulations with regard to Church prayer (1 Tim. ii.), laying special stress on prayer for those in authority.¹ On the other hand the great doxologies (1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 15 f.) already show traces of a fixed liturgical usage; while iii. 16 is probably a fragment of an old ecclesiastical hymn. So too the passage 2 Tim. ii. 8 probably echoes the stereotyped way in which the Church confessed and established its faith in the Messiahship of Christ; perhaps a baptismal confession (1 Tim. vi. 12). The regular reading of Old Testament Scripture was certainly practised in Christian Churches from the beginning, as shown by the acquaintance with it that Paul takes for granted in Rome and Galatia; so that there is nothing strange in the use of Scripture in thanksgiving at meals (iv. 5). But that evangelical texts are in v. 18 already reckoned as Scripture can only be asserted, if our epistle be put into a time when it cannot possibly have been written, as we see from the ecclesiastical relations implied. The fact

¹ It is only possible to hear the voice of apologists in ii. 2 by a misinterpretation of the passage as common as it is adverse to the wording and context; for the passage does not say that by such intercession they are to procure for themselves a peaceful life undisturbed by the authorities, but that such prayer alone is in harmony with Christian life secluded from the world and averse to interference in its affairs. When Holtzmann also saw in the *ὑπὲρ βασιλείων* a reference to the time (after 137) when there were imperial co-regents, he failed to observe that the absence of the article makes this grammatically impossible. Neither in 2 Tim. i. 8 nor elsewhere is there any allusion to a time of severe persecution.

that women are still forbidden to teach (ii. 12), and that it is necessary to give a warning against desecrating the services of the Church by disputes and love of dress (ii. 8 f.), which exactly recalls the immature state of the Corinthian Church, is certainly no mark of a later time.

§ 29. THE CRITICISM OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

1. The scientific criticism of the Pastoral Epistles begins with Schleiermacher (*Ueber den sogen. ersten Brief des Paulus an Tim.*, Berlin, 1807), who endeavoured to prove that the first Epistle to Timothy was a compilation from the two other Pastoral ones. But the passages, e.g. 1 Tim. i. 20 (comp. § 27, 1, note 1), in which one of the other epistles is said to be presupposed and unskilfully imitated, as also the alleged want of aim and connection, are capable of explanation by a somewhat more careful exegesis; and the epistle is not more closely allied to the other two than these are to one another. Therefore, although Schleiermacher still finds followers, it was soon seen that the other two Pastoral Epistles must stand and fall with the first to Timothy; Schleiermacher himself pointed out so many difficulties that applied with equal force to all three, that since Eichhorn and de Wette in their Introductions (1812, 21) declared all three to be spurious, the strife has always been concentrated on the Pastoral Epistles generally.¹ The dispute either turned

¹ In favour of Schleiermacher are Lücke (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1834, 4), Neander, Bleek, Usteri (in his *Paul. Lehrbegr.*), and in the main Credner also. Comp. also Rudow, *De Argum. Hist. quibus Epist. Pastor. origo Paul. impugnata est*, Gott., 1853. Ritschl and Krauss have also incidentally declared themselves favourable to his view. H. Planck (*Bem. über den 1. paul. Brief an Tim.*, Gött., 1808), Beckhaus (*Specimen Observ.*, etc., 1810), and Wegscheider (*der erste Brief des Paulus an den Tim.*, Gött., 1810) at once came forward against him. Comp. also Curtius, *De Tempore quo prior Pi. ad Tim. Epist. exar. sit*, Berlin, 1828. Credner, Schott, Neudecker, Mayerhoff (in his *Colosserbrief*, 1838), Ewald, Meyer, and Mangold very soon attached themselves to the criticism of Eichhorn and de

on the question as to whether the epistles were written by the Apostle himself or by one of his disciples at his direction, probably, as Schott supposed, by Luke; or else the negative position that they could not have proceeded from Paul was taken up. The most prominent argument always was that they could not be inserted in the life of Paul with which we are familiar; and that they were directed against errorists and relations of the Church unknown to the genuine Pauline epistles. All this is freely conceded, but it only proves that they belong to an epoch of his life subsequent to his release from the first Roman captivity, of which we have no other historical testimony or early record. It is likewise conceded that they contain much that is peculiar in their doctrinal method as well as in verbal expression, which gives a general impression of strangeness to one who comes to them from the older epistles. Much of this however is sufficiently explained by the peculiar contents of the epistles, and from the entirely new phenomena which they oppose. But to conclude at once that they are spurious, from that which has not and perhaps never can be explained, is forbidden by the growing insight into the wealth and mobility of the Pauline intellect, which must not be fettered in mode of teaching or expression by a rule taken from a number of older epistles arbitrarily selected. Above all, it is an established fact that the essential, fundamental features of the Pauline doctrine of salvation are even in their specific expression reproduced in our epistles with a clearness such as we do not find in any Pauline disciple excepting perhaps Luke or the Roman Clement. The extent to which the expression fully agrees with that of Paul is shown by the

Wette; while Hug, Bertholdt, Guericke, the commentaries of Heydenreich (1826), Mack (1836), and Leo (1837), defended all three epistles. Comp. also Böhl, *über die Zeit. der Abfassung u. den paul. Character der Briefe an Tim. u. Tit.*, Berl., 1829, and Kling in his appendix to Flatt's lectures, Tüb., 1831.

fact that criticism can only explain this agreement on the hypothesis of an intentional imitation of Pauline passages; which remains a *petitio principii* so long as it is possible to come to an adequate understanding of the epistles without it.

2. Hence the only point in question is, whether the spuriousness of the Pastoral Epistles can be proved on positive grounds. In the first place we must adhere to the position that the external attestation of the epistles is quite on a par with that of the other Paulines (§ 16, 1). They must therefore betray the fact that they are pseudonymous productions by unmistakable internal signs; above all, the tendency to give weight to their directions and teaching by an apostolic authority must be suspiciously prominent. It has been made a ground of objection that Paul, though speaking to his intimate disciples, expressly designates himself an apostle; but this may easily be explained from the circumstance that he is not writing a word of fatherly love to his spiritual children, but letters containing directions regarding matters of business and admonitions relating to office.¹ If the factitious and inconsistent character of the situation in all three epistles be regarded as evidence of fiction

¹ But the passages in which Paul emphasizes the fact that he is entrusted with the free or universal gospel (1 Tim. i. 11, ii. 7) are just as clearly explained from the connection as the passages 2 Tim. i. 11; Tit. i. 3, where he makes his personal calling a guarantee of the manifestation of salvation. The passage 1 Tim. i. 12-16, where he draws the sum of saving truth from his own life-experience, no more contains an enhanced humility on his part than 2 Tim. iii. 10, 11, where he reminds the disciple of the example of his Christian life that had formerly influenced him to become a Christian himself, contains exaggerated self-praise, as appears in both cases from the undoubted evidence of the Corinthian Epistles. But while the reason why Paul in the latter passage mentions his experiences in the home of Timothy is quite easily explained on the assumption of the genuineness, the opposite assumption first gives rise to the difficulty of explaining why the pseudonymous writer, to whom the Apostle's whole life lay open, should have chosen these very events. Finally, to find in 2 Tim. iv. 6 ff. a studied self-preparation for martyrdom, is a mere matter of opinion.

(comp. especially Holtzmann in his Introduction), it is impossible to conceive *à priori* why the pseudonymous author who confessedly did not attach himself to the situations and relations of Paul's life with which we are familiar, did not choose a more simple and less contradictory situation. But we have already shown that the epistles can be explained with perfect clearness from the situations they presuppose (§ 27, 1, 3, 5). It is a mere inconsistency to object at one time that the directions of our epistles put the apostolic disciples too much on a level with school-boys and demand too little from the officers of the Church, and then to maintain that the former were placed there as the ideal of the future bishop, and the latter as a clergy with hierarchical claims. The fiction would undoubtedly betray itself as such if the pseudonymous writer had represented the errors of his time as having been foretold by the Apostle; and then falling out of his character had combated them as being present. As a matter of fact however, the doctrinal errors of our epistles appear throughout as present; while nothing is in truth to be seen of the alleged mixture of present and future.² On the other hand we see in this reproach only a symptom of a prevailing peculiarity of the criticism that attaches itself to Schleiermacher and de Wette, and which still plays an important part especially in the Pastoral Epistles. The supposed proof of spuriousness rests now on a misapprehension of the right connection, again on fancied

* Erroneous doctrine of a dualist, ascetic nature, is foretold only in 1 Tim. iv. 1-3, and has nothing whatever to do with the doctrinal errors combated. On the contrary 2 Tim. iii. 1-5 predicts only a moral corruption concealing itself under the cloke of piety, which begets a partiality for doctrines that are not inimical to it (iv. 3). Compare § 23, 1, note 3. But the former could not have taken place if ascetic inclinations had not already appeared (not by any means, however, in the present doctrinal errors), to which it might at a future time be prejudicial (1 Tim. iv. 8); and the latter only takes place because a similar immoral pretence of piety already characterizes the present doctrinal errors (2 Tim. iii. 6 f.).

distortion of thought or inappropriateness of expression; or finally on the imagined discovery of certain difficulties with regard to the historical apprehension. But it is overlooked that there is no Pauline epistle which, if approached with the same prejudice against its genuineness, does not afford abundant occasion for the very same criticism, and present similar difficulties that can only be solved with a comparative degree of certainty. On the other hand illogical writing, want of arrangement, distorted thoughts and inappropriate expressions or strange inconsistencies, are not necessarily marks of a pseudonymous author; on the contrary, exegesis will always adhere to the task of explaining the epistle on the presupposition that the pseudonymous writer has carried out the part he had once assumed, conformably to the object he has in view.

3. With regard to the Pastoral Epistles also, it was Baur (*Die sogen. Pastoralbriefe.*, Stuttg. u. Tüb., 1835) who first set the true limits to criticism. Such criticism cannot be brought to a conclusion so long as it is exclusively occupied with the consideration of individual reasons for doubting the genuineness; it is only if the origin of the epistles can be explained by the relations and tendencies of a definite later time visible in them, that we gain an historical apprehension of their nature. Baur thought he had attained this by making the epistles originate in the second century with the object of combating the Gnostic heresy in the Apostle's name, and of protecting the Church against its intrusion by a more rigid hierarchical organization. Although the first positions of Baur have been already modified by pupils like Schwegler, Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, while the attempt originally made by Baur to prove in them the union-tendency attributed by him to the second century has been universally abandoned, yet his fundamental conception has been very widely adopted by Schenkel, Pfeleiderer, Hausrath, Renan, and even by Immer, Beyschlag, Weizsäcker and

others. Ewald and Mangold (*die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe.*, Marburg, 1856) have indeed expressly rejected Baur's view, adhering to that of the older criticism according to which the epistle still belongs to the first century. On the other hand Bahnsen has endeavoured on the basis of his hypothesis to give a detailed explanation of the second Epistle to Timothy in particular (*die sogen. Pastoralbriefe*, Leipzig, 1876); while Holtzmann (*die Pastoralbriefe*, Leipzig, 1880, compare also his Introduction) has attempted to review the sum of this criticism and by putting together its positive results to bring it to a settlement. But this very attempt has shown how far criticism still is from arriving at a definite historical apprehension of our epistles in such a way. It has been obliged to concede that the concrete features of any Gnostic system of the second century with which we are familiar, do not appear in the doctrinal errors here combated.¹ So too it has been proved, after exhaustive refutation of Baur's first attempts, that the Church-government presupposed or aimed at in our epistles, shows nothing yet of the changed form characteristic of the second century; while it is not only impossible, as already shown, actually to prove its alleged hierarchical tendencies, but they are precluded by features of a directly contrary nature. Hence criticism has by no means arrived at a definite judgment as yet respecting the time of the epistles. While Beyschlag holds to the time of Trajan, Hausrath is in favour of Hadrian's time; Pflieger divides the epistles between

¹ If it be asserted that the admission of such features is intentionally avoided because it would have contradicted the fiction that Paul had already combated them, this implies a refinement of falsification that is quite foreign to the naïvete of pseudonymous authorship. And if be said that it appeared safer and at least more convenient to dismiss the Gnostic speculations *a limine*, than to enter into a more minute refutation of them, this only lifts them once more out of the historical circle in which they are said to have originated; since the Church of the second century never failed in confidence of power to overcome Gnosis with spiritual weapons.

Trajan and Hadrian, while Holtzmann again goes beyond the time of the latter; on the other hand Hilgenfeld and Schenkel agree with Baur in putting the composition of the epistles about 150, while Volkmar leaves the time open till 170.²

4. Hence arises the question, whether, even apart from the enquiry how far success has been or can be achieved in definitely fixing the time of the epistles and the relations they presuppose, their origin can be explained by the aim respecting which later criticism assuming their spuriousness, is essentially agreed. But the second Epistle to Timothy, which is generally regarded as the earliest, and in which therefore the aim of the composition must appear most obviously, is for the most part taken up with admonitions to Christian courage under suffering, and to faithful fulfilment of the Christian calling; which have nothing to do with this aim and cannot even form a secondary one, since they nowhere recur in this form in the other epistles. Undoubtedly prevailing doctrinal errors are here combated; but Timothy is only admonished in the most earnest way to take no part in them, while we meet with no direction as to Church-government that might afford protection against them or supply means of resisting them, so that here in any

² Nor do complete clearness and unanimity by any means prevail respecting the question whether the three epistles proceed from the same time and from the same author, as well as respecting the order in which they were written. If they are from the same hand, the objections to their Pauline authorship that have been found in the relation they bear to one another, are not removed. The fact that 1 Tim. is generally supposed to have been written last, is only a result of the criticism of Schleiermacher; of which the chief causes at least fall away entirely if all three epistles be ascribed to the same author. The reason why Mangold puts the Epistle to Titus first, rests only on his peculiar conception of the opponents there combated; a conception not adopted by recent critics (§ 28, 1, note 1); but the reason why 2 Tim. is generally put first, also rests only on the feeling that it contains most Pauline characteristics; which, however, is entirely without significance on the supposition of its pseudonymous character.

case the former alleged aim does not appear. We certainly find in Titus an endeavour, by means of Church-organization and the union of the work of teaching with office in the Church, to ensure purity of doctrine; but the organization there aimed at is the old presbyterian organization and no ecclesiastical innovation. The epistle however is mainly taken up with directions for the instruction of the most diverse classes of Church-members in the Christian life; and these again have nothing to do with the former alleged tendency. Only in the first Epistle to Timothy do we find doctrinal errors and Church-organization equally discussed; but the author's wish that bishops should apply themselves to teaching (iii. 2, v. 16), hence likewise to the combination of these two points characteristic of such tendency, appears only indirectly. No directions are given to the bishops to combat these errors; but only to Timothy. As in the Epistle to Titus, the question turns only on the requisite qualifications for their office, that have nothing to do with such a problem; all that is said of discipline respecting them, has reference to moral defects and not doctrinal errors. Then follow analogous precepts for the office of deacon and the institution of widows, which in the nature of the thing have nothing to do with the doctrinal question, directions respecting Church-prayer and the maintenance of widows, admonitions to slaves and to the rich, that are as remote as possible from such tendency; while even the polemic against doctrinal errors is combined with warnings against unfruitful asceticism and the love of money that is destruction to the soul; which certainly have nothing to do with the alleged tendency of the epistles. Hence it must be conceded that the view of a Church organizer whose object it is by developing and strengthening the episcopal office of teacher and pastor to protect the doctrine that had been handed down against the disorder of the Churches infected by Gnostic errors, explains our epistles only in a very

small degree, but that the question why three such epistles were composed with this object, and why an apostolic name was borrowed for them at a time when, as the history of the Canon teaches, apostolic epistles were not yet by any means the specific normal authority, still remains entirely unanswered.

5. The personal notices scattered throughout our epistles and the peculiarity of the relations there presupposed, presented special difficulty against the hypothesis of spuriousness. Even the first Epistle to Timothy contains in i. 20 an allusion to two men delivered unto Satan; and in v. 23 a dietary prescription for Timothy, of which it would be hard to say how the pseudonymous writer came to mention them. The Epistle to Titus transfers the Apostle with his ministry to Crete, to which place nothing in the Pauline epistles with which we are familiar points; and in iii. 12-14 brings in a number of personal notices that have no connection whatever with its aim, and for which the other Paulines do not offer the smallest point of attachment. In this respect however, the second Epistle to Timothy presents most difficulties. It may of course be said that the names of Timothy's mother and grandmother (i. 5) or the experiences of the Apostle in his imprisonment (iv. 14-17) are borrowed from tradition for the purpose of giving life and colour to the composition; but any such explanation is invalidated by the notices contained in i. 15-18 which in their briefness of allusion are so hard to understand. So too it may be said that in the numerous personal notices adduced (iv. 10-15, 19-21), the author had in his mind isolated names taken from the earlier epistles, or relations and situations known from the Acts, though he must have been very shortsighted not to see the contradictions in which the use of them would involve him; but side by side with familiar names we find others that are quite unknown, side by side with combinations that are natural to say the least, others

that are quite remote and purposeless, such as the cloak and books said to have been left by Paul with Carpus at Troas which remain entirely inexplicable. Hence it is that the hypothesis of spuriousness has so frequently been associated with the opinion that some genuine Pauline remains lie at the foundation of the epistles.¹ But it is hardly possible to form any conceivable notion of the manner and object of such Pauline notes; and the use of them in letters with whose aim they have nothing whatever to do could only be intended to give the latter the appearance of genuine Pauline letters; a theory on which they lose the character of free pseudonymous productions and become actual refined forgeries, which all interpolations of genuine epistles in the interest of a tendency must *à priori* be regarded.

6. The first who came forward against the criticism of Baur were Michael Baumgarten (*die Echtheit der Pastoralbriefe*, Berlin, 1837), Böttger (*Beitr. zur hist.-krit. Einl.*, Gött., 1837, 38), and Wieseler; while in recent times the epistles have been defended particularly by Thiersch, Lange, Delitzsch (*Zeitschr. für luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1851), Otto (*die geschichtlichen Verhältnisse der Pastoralbriefe*, Leipzig, 1860), Ginella (*De Authentia Epist. S. Pauli Pastor.*, Breslau, 1865), Laurent (in his *NTL. Studien*, 1866), Stirm (*Jahrb. für*

¹ Credner in his Introduction (1836) already held that the second Epistle to Timothy owed its origin to the two genuine Pauline epistles, by means of combination and interpolation; while Ewald, Weisse, Hitzig and Krenkel saw in it and the Epistle to Titus a number of shorter writings containing commissions, news, etc., which they regarded as the authentic nucleus of our epistles. Hausrath, Pfeiderer, Immer and others found such a nucleus in second Timothy; and finally Lemme (*das echte Ermahnungsschreiben des Ap. Paulus an Tim.*, Breslau, 1882) has declared the whole epistle, with the exception of ii. 11-iv. 5, to be genuine. Even Grau regards the epistle as having been first composed after the death of the Apostle by Tim. and Tit. themselves with the help of notes and personal recollections; while Plitt (*die Pastoralbriefe*, Berlin, 1872) tries to make out that all three are genuine Pauline epistles worked over.

deutsche Theol., 1872, 76), Herzog (*über die Abfassungszeit der Pastoralbriefe*, 1872), and Kölling (*der erste Brief an Timotheus*, Berlin, 1882); as also in the commentaries of Matthies, Wiesinger, Huther, Oosterzee, Hofmann, and Beck. In his Introduction Reuss had persistently defended the genuineness of the epistles; but in the fifth edition (1874) he entertained many doubts; and in his *épit. Paul.* (1878) he still adhered only to the second Epistle to Timothy. The strength of the defence was weakened beforehand by the fact that one class of defenders using all conceivable harmonistic arts, endeavoured to bring the epistles into the life of the Apostle with which we are familiar; whereas others admitted that they could only be supported if they belonged to a time subsequent to the Apostle's release from his Roman captivity. Moreover, neither the doctrinal errors combated in our epistles nor the relations of the Churches which they presuppose were investigated with sufficient thoroughness to throw any real light on the points where the attack on them always recommenced. Finally, even in pointing out in the epistles what was Pauline in doctrine and expression, there was much neglect in showing and explaining what was really peculiar in them. Thus it came about that notwithstanding all zeal in defending the epistles, the opinion that their genuineness could scarcely be supported on scientific grounds found ever-increasing acceptance.

7. Since the Apostle's release from the Roman captivity cannot be proved by any historical evidence apart from these epistles if they are genuine (§ 26, 7); and since their genuineness can only be proved on the assumption that this release did take place, it must be conceded that we have here a circular proof that does not admit of a definitive scientific decision. It must further be conceded that the doctrinal errors against which our epistles are directed cannot be historically indicated, that the time in which the firmer Church organization here aimed at, and in particular

the combination of teaching with office in the Church, was carried into effect, cannot be historically fixed; so that it is impossible to carry out the proof that our epistles must belong to the second half of the years 60-70. Finally it must be admitted that the question as to whether the deviations in doctrine and expression actually existing between these and the other Pauline epistles can be explained from the relations of time and by a change of form brought about by the Apostle himself, is incapable of definite scientific proof. But it must likewise be affirmed that our epistles are fully explained by the relations presupposed in them; and that the alleged difficulties may be removed by an unprejudiced exegesis; while on the other hand the hypothesis of spuriousness has not yet explained the state of things existing at that time, and involves incomparably greater difficulties than the view that they are, what they profess to be, epistles of Paul, proceeding from the last period of his life otherwise unknown to us. Compare in Meyer's Commentary, the fifth edition of the *krit.-exeg. Handbuch* on the Epistles of Timothy and Titus, revised by B. Weiss, Gött., 1885.

[END OF VOL. I.]





BS
2330
W4
V.1

**THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara**

**THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.**

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 001 004 688 6

